arXiv:1303.6752v1 [math.DS] 27 Mar 2013

Seifert conjecture in the even convex case

Chungen Liu [*] and Duanzhi Zhang [†]

School of Mathematics and LPMC, Nankai University
Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China

Abstract

In this paper, we prove that there exist at least n geometrically distinct brake orbits on every C^2 compact convex symmetric hypersurface Σ in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ satisfying the reversible condition $N\Sigma = \Sigma$ with $N = \mathrm{diag}(-I_n, I_n)$. As a consequence, we show that if the Hamiltonian function is convex and even, then Seifert conjecture of 1948 on the multiplicity of brake orbits holds for any positive integer n.

MSC(2000): 58E05; 70H05; 34C25

Key words: Brake orbit, Seifert conjecture, Lagrangian boundary condition, Convex symmetric, Maslov-type index

1 Introduction

For the standard symplectic space $(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \omega_0)$ with $\omega_0(x, y) = \langle Jx, y\rangle$, where $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ is the standard symplectic matrix and I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix, an involution matrix defined by $N = \begin{pmatrix} -I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$ is clearly anti-symplectic, i.e., $NJ = -JN$. The fixed point set of N and $-N$ are the Lagrangian subspaces $L_0 = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n$ and $L_1 = \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\}$ of $(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \omega_0)$ respectively.

Suppose $H \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}, \mathbf{R}) \cap C^1(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$ satisfying the following reversible condition

$$H(Nx) = H(x), \qquad \forall\, x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}. \tag{1.1}$$

---

[*] Partially supported by the NSF of China (11071127, 10621101), 973 Program of MOST (2011CB808002). E-mail: liucg@nankai.edu.cn

[†] Partially supported by the NSF of China (10801078, 11171341) and Nankai University. E-mail: zhangdz@nankai.edu.cn

We consider the following fixed energy problem of nonlinear Hamiltonian system with Lagrangian boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= JH'(x(t)), && (1.2)\\ H(x(t)) &= h, && (1.3)\\ x(0) &\in L_0,\ x(\tau/2)\in L_0. && (1.4) \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that a solution (τ, x) of (1.2)-(1.4) is a characteristic chord on the contact submanifold $\Sigma := H^{-1}(h) = \{y \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \mid H(y) = h\}$ of $(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \omega_0)$ and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} x(-t) &= Nx(t), && (1.5)\\ x(\tau+t) &= x(t). && (1.6) \end{aligned}$$

In this paper this kind of τ-periodic characteristic (τ, x) is called a *brake orbit* on the hypersurface Σ. We denote by $\mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, H)$ the set of all brake orbits on Σ. Two brake orbits $(\tau_i, x_i) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, H),\ i = 1, 2$ are equivalent if the two brake orbits are geometrically the same, i.e., $x_1(\mathbf{R}) = x_2(\mathbf{R})$. We denote by $[(\tau, x)]$ the equivalent class of $(\tau, x) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, H)$ in this equivalent relation and by $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma)$ the set of $[(\tau, x)]$ for all $(\tau, x) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, H)(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma)$ is in fact the set of geometrically distinct brake orbits on Σ). From now on, in the notation $[(\tau, x)]$ we always assume x has minimal period τ. We also denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma)$ the set of all geometrically distinct closed characteristics on Σ. The number of elements in a set S is denoted by ${}^{\#}S$. It is well known that ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma)$ (and also ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma)$) is only depending on Σ, that is to say, for simplicity we take $h = 1$, if H and G are two C^2 functions satisfying (1.1) and $\Sigma_H := H^{-1}(1) = \Sigma_G := G^{-1}(1)$, then ${}^{\#}\mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma_H) ={}^{\#} \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma_G)$. So we can consider the brake orbit problem in a more general setting. Let Σ be a C^2 compact hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ bounding a compact set C with nonempty interior. Suppose Σ has non-vanishing Guassian curvature and satisfies the reversible condition $N(\Sigma - x_0) = \Sigma - x_0 := \{x - x_0 | x \in \Sigma\}$ for some $x_0 \in C$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $x_0 = 0$. We denote the set of all such hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ by $\mathcal{H}_b(2n)$. For $x \in \Sigma$, let $N_\Sigma(x)$ be the unit outward normal vector at $x \in \Sigma$. Note that here by the reversible condition there holds $N_\Sigma(Nx) = NN_\Sigma(x)$. We consider the dynamics problem of finding $\tau > 0$ and an absolutely continuous curve $x : [0, \tau] \to \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= JN_\Sigma(x(t)), \qquad x(t)\in\Sigma, && (1.7)\\ x(-t) &= Nx(t), \qquad x(\tau+t) = x(t), \qquad \text{for all } t\in\mathbf{R}. && (1.8) \end{aligned}$$

A solution (τ, x) of the problem (1.7)-(1.8) determines a brake orbit on Σ.

Definition 1.1. *We denote by*

$$\mathcal{H}_b^c(2n) = \{\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b(2n) |\ \Sigma \text{ is strictly convex } \},$$
$$\mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n) = \{\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^c(2n) |\ -\Sigma = \Sigma\}.$$

The main result of this paper is the following

Theorem 1.1. *For any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$, there holds*

$$^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq n.$$

Remark 1.1. Theorem 1.1 is a kind of multiplicity result related to the Arnold chord conjecture. The Arnold chord conjecture is an existence result which was prove by K. Mohnke in [26]. Another kind of multiplicity result related to the Arnold chord conjecture was proved in [13].

1.1 Seifert conjecture

Let us recall the famous conjecture proposed by H. Seifert in his pioneer work [28] concerning the multiplicity of brake orbits in certain Hamiltonian systems in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$.

As a special case of (1.1), we assume $H \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$ possesses the following form

$$H(p,q) = \frac{1}{2}A(q)p \cdot p + V(q), \tag{1.9}$$

where $p, q \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $A(q)$ is a positive definite $n \times n$ for any $q \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and A is C^2, $V \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^n, \mathbf{R})$ is the potential energy. It is clear that a solution of the following Hamiltonian system

$$\dot{x} = JH'(x), \quad x = (p,q), \tag{1.10}$$
$$p(0) = p(\frac{\tau}{2}) = 0. \tag{1.11}$$

is a brake orbit. Moreover, if h is the total energy of a brake orbit (q,p), i.e., $H(p(t), q(t)) = h$ and $V(q(0)) = V(q(\tau)) = h$. Then $q(t) \in \bar{\Omega} \equiv \{q \in \mathbf{R}^n | V(q) \leq h\}$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$.

In [28] of 1948, H. Seifert studied the existence of brake orbit for system (1.10)-(1.11) with the Hamiltonian function H in the form of (1.9) and proved that $\mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset$ provided $V' \neq 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, V is analytic and $\bar{\Omega}$ is bounded and homeomorphic to the unit ball $B_1^n(0)$ in $\mathbf{R}^n$. Then in the same paper he proposed the following conjecture which is still open for $n \geq 2$ now:

$$^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq n \textit{ under the same conditions.}$$

It is well known that the lower bound n in the Seifert conjecture cannot be improved. A typical example is the Hamiltonian function

$$H(p,q) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j^2 q_j^2, \qquad q, p \in \mathbf{R}^n,$$

where $a_i/a_j \notin \mathbf{Q}$ for all $i \neq j$ and $q = (q_1, q_2, ..., q_n)$. There are exactly n geometrically distinct brake orbits on the energy hypersurface $\Sigma = H^{-1}(h)$.

1.2 Some related results since 1948

As a special case, letting $A(q) = I$ in (1.9), the problem corresponds to the following classical fixed energy problem of the second order autonomous Hamiltonian system

$$\ddot{q}(t) + V'(q(t)) = 0, \quad \text{for } q(t) \in \Omega, \tag{1.12}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}|\dot{q}(t)|^2 + V(q(t)) = h, \qquad \forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \tag{1.13}$$

$$\dot{q}(0) = \dot{q}(\frac{\tau}{2}) = 0, \tag{1.14}$$

where $V \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^n, \mathbf{R})$ and h is constant such that $\Omega \equiv \{q \in \mathbf{R}^n | V(q) < h\}$ is nonempty, bounded and connected.

A solution (τ, q) of (1.12)-(1.14) is still called a *brake orbit* in $\bar{\Omega}$. Two brake orbits q_1 and $q_2 : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}^n$ are *geometrically distinct* if $q_1(\mathbf{R}) \neq q_2(\mathbf{R})$. We denote by $\mathcal{O}(\Omega, V)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\Omega)$ the sets of all brake orbits and geometrically distinct brake orbits in $\bar{\Omega}$ respectively.

Remark 1.2. It is well known that via

$$H(p,q) = \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 + V(q),$$

$x = (p, q)$ and $p = \dot{q}$, the elements in $\mathcal{O}(\Omega, V)$ and the solutions of (1.2)-(1.4) are one to one correspondent.

Definition 1.2. *For $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$, a brake orbit (τ, x) on Σ is called symmetric if $x(\mathbf{R}) = -x(\mathbf{R})$. Similarly, for a C^2 convex symmetric bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, a brake orbit $(\tau, q) \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega, V)$ is called symmetric if $q(\mathbf{R}) = -q(\mathbf{R})$.*

Note that a brake orbit $(\tau, x) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, H)$ with minimal period τ is symmetric if $x(t + \tau/2) = -x(t)$ for $t \in \mathbf{R}$, a brake orbit $(\tau, q) \in \mathcal{O}(\Omega, V)$ with minimal period τ is symmetric if $q(t + \tau/2) = -q(t)$ for $t \in \mathbf{R}$.

After 1948, many studies have been carried out for the brake orbit problem. In 1978, S. Bolotin proved in [4] the existence of brake orbits in general setting. In 1983-1984, K. Hayashi in [14], H.

Gluck and W. Ziller in [11], and V. Benci in [2] proved ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\Omega) \geq 1$ if V is C^1, $\bar{\Omega} = \{V \leq h\}$ is compact, and $V'(q) \neq 0$ for all $q \in \partial\Omega$. In 1987, P. Rabinowitz in [27] proved that if H satisfies (1.1), $\Sigma \equiv H^{-1}(h)$ is star-shaped, and $x \cdot H'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \Sigma$, then ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq 1$. In 1987, V. Benci and F. Giannoni gave a different proof of the existence of one brake orbit in [3]. In 2005, it has been pointed out in [8] that the problem of finding brake orbits is equivalent to find orthogonal geodesic chords on manifold with concave boundary. In 2010, R. Giambò, F. Giannoni and P. Piccione in [9] proved the existence of an orthogonal geodesic chord on a Riemannian manifold homeomorphic to a closed disk and with concave boundary. For multiplicity of the brake problems, in 1973, A. Weinstein in [31] proved a localized result: *Assume H satisfies (1.1). For any h sufficiently close to $H(z_0)$ with z_0 is a nondegenerate local minimum of H, there are n geometrically distinct brake orbits on the energy surface $H^{-1}(h)$.* In [5] of 1978 and in [11] of 1983, under assumptions of Seifert in [28], it was proved the existence of at least n brake orbits while a very strong assumption on the energy integral was used to ensure that different minimax critical levels correspond to geometrically distinct brake orbits. In 1989, A. Szulkin in [29] proved that ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(H^{-1}(h)) \geq n$, if H satisfies conditions in [27] of Rabinowitz and the energy hypersurface $H^{-1}(h)$ is $\sqrt{2}$-pinched. In 1985 E. van Groesen in [12] and in 1993 A. Ambrosetti, V. Benci, Y. Long in [1] also proved ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\Omega) \geq n$ under different pinching conditions. In 2006, without pinching condition, in [23] Y. Long, C. Zhu and the second author of this paper proved that: *For any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$ with $n \geq 2$, there holds ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq 2$.* In 2009, the authors of this paper in [19] proved that ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] + 1$ for $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$. Moreover it was proved that if all brake orbits on Σ are nondegenerate, then ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq n + \mathfrak{A}(\Sigma)$, where $2\mathfrak{A}(\Sigma)$ is the number of geometrically distinct asymmetric brake orbits on Σ. Recently, in [32] the authors of this paper improved the results of [19] to that ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq \left[\frac{n+1}{2}\right] + 1$ for $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$, $n \geq 3$. In [33] the authors of this paper proved that ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) \geq \left[\frac{n+1}{2}\right] + 2$ for $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$, $n \geq 4$.

1.3 Some consequences of Theorem 1.1 and further arguments

As direct consequences of Theorem 1.1 we have the following two important Corollaries.

Corollary 1.1. *If $H(p,q)$ defined by (1.9) is even and convex, then Seifert conjecture holds.*

Remark 1.3. If the function H in Remark 1.1 is convex and even, then V is convex and even, and Ω is convex and central symmetric. Hence Ω is homeomorphic to the unit open ball in $\mathbf{R}^n$.

Recently, R. Giambò, F. Giannoni, and P. Piccione in [10] gave some counterexamples to the Seifert conjecture by constructing some analytic functions H with the form (1.9) such that the domain $\Omega = V^{-1}(-\infty, h)$ is homeomorphic to the unit open ball, where h is a regular value of V, and there is only one brake orbit on $H^{-1}(h)$. We note that in their examples the functions H are neither even nor convex, so we suspect that the convex and symmetric conditions are essential to guarantee the Seifert conjecture in some sense.

Corollary 1.2. *Suppose* $V(0)=0$, $V(q)\ge 0$, $V(-q)=V(q)$ *and* $V''(q)$ *is positive definite for all* $q\in\mathbf{R}^n\setminus\{0\}$. *Then for any given* $h>0$ *and* $\Omega\equiv\{q\in\mathbf{R}^n|V(q)<h\}$, *there holds*

$$^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\Omega)\ge n.$$

It is interesting to ask the following question: *whether all closed characteristics on any hypersurfaces* $\Sigma\in\mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$ *are symmetric brake orbits after suitable time translation provided that* $^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma)<+\infty$? In this direction, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *For any* $\Sigma\in\mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$, *suppose*

$$^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma)=n.$$

Then all of the n *closed characteristics on* Σ *are symmetric brake orbits after suitable time translation.*

For $n=2$, it was proved in [15] that $^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\Sigma)$ is either 2 or $+\infty$ for any C^2 compact convex hypersurface Σ in $\mathbf{R}^4$. So Theorem 1.2 give a positive answer to the above question in the case $n=2$. We note also that for the hypersurface $\Sigma=\{(x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2)\in\mathbf{R}^4|\ x_1^2+y_1^2+\frac{x_2^2+y_2^2}{4}=1\}$ there hold $^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma)=+\infty$ and $^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b^s(\Sigma)=2$. Here we denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b^s(\Sigma)$ the set of all symmetric brake orbits on Σ. We also note that on the hypersurface $\Sigma=\{x\in\mathbf{R}^{2n}|\ |x|=1\}$ there are some non-brake closed characteristics.

The key ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.1 are some ideas from our previous paper [19] and the following result which generalizes corresponding results of our previous papers [32, 33] completely, where the iteration path γ^2 will be defined in Definition 2.5 below.

Theorem 1.3. *For* $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, *let* $P=\gamma(\tau)$. *If* $i_{L_0}(\gamma)\ge 0$, $i_{L_1}(\gamma)\ge 0$, $i(\gamma)\ge n$, $\gamma^2(t)=\gamma(t-\tau)\gamma(\tau)$ *for all* $t\in[\tau,2\tau]$, *then*

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma)+S^+_{P^2}(1)-\nu_{L_0}(\gamma)\ge 0. \tag{1.15}$$

In this paper, we denote by $\mathbf{N}$, $\mathbf{Z}$, $\mathbf{Q}$, $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ the sets of positive integers, integers, rational numbers, real numbers and complex numbers respectively. We denote by both $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and $\cdot$ the standard inner product in $\mathbf{R}^n$ or $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, by $(\cdot,\cdot)$ the inner product of corresponding Hilbert space. For any $a\in\mathbf{R}$, we denote by $[a]=\sup\{k\in\mathbf{Z}|k\le a\}$.

2 Index theories for symplectic paths and the homotopic properties of symplectic matrices

In this section we make some preparations for the proof of Theorems 1.1-1.2. We first briefly introduce the Maslov-type index theory of (i_{L_j}, ν_{L_j}) for $j = 0, 1$ and (i_ω, ν_ω) for $\omega \in \mathbf{U} := \{z \in \mathbf{C} | \, |z| = 1\}$.

Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ denotes the set of $2n \times 2n$ real matrices and $\mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ denotes its subset of symmetric ones. For any $F \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$, we denote by $m^*(F)$ the dimension of maximal positive definite subspace, negative definite subspace, and kernel of any F for $* = +, -, 0$ respectively.

Let $J_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_k \\ I_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $N_k = \begin{pmatrix} -I_k & 0 \\ 0 & I_k \end{pmatrix}$ with I_k being the identity in $\mathbf{R}^k$. If $k = n$ we will omit the subscript k for convenience, i.e., $J_n = J$ and $N_n = N$.

The symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}(2k)$ for any $k \in \mathbf{N}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{Sp}(2k) = \{M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}^{2k}) | M^T J_k M = J_k\},$$

where M^T is the transpose of matrix M.

For any $\tau > 0$, the symplectic path in $\mathrm{Sp}(2k)$ starting from the identity I_{2k} is defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_\tau(2k) = \{\gamma \in C([0, \tau], \mathrm{Sp}(2k)) | \gamma(0) = I_{2k}\}.$$

In the study of periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems, the Maslov-type index theory of $(i(\gamma), \nu(\gamma))$ of γ usually plays a important role which was introduced by C. Conley and E. Zehnder in [7] for nondegenerate symplectic path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ with $n \geq 2$, by Y. Long and E. Zehnder in [24] for nondegenerate symplectic path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2)$, by Long in [22] and C. Viterbo in [30] for $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(2n)$. In [20], Long introduced the ω-index which is an index function $(i_\omega(\gamma), \nu_\omega(\gamma)) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \{0, 1, \cdots, 2n\}$ for $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$.

For any $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$, the following hypersurface in $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ is defined by:

$$\mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega = \{M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n) | \det(M - \omega I_{2n}) = 0\}.$$

For any two continuous path ξ and η: $[0, \tau] \to \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ with $\xi(\tau) = \eta(0)$, their joint path is defined by

$$\eta * \xi(t) = \begin{cases} \xi(2t) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{\tau}{2}, \\ \eta(2t - \tau) & \text{if } \frac{\tau}{2} \leq t \leq \tau. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Given any two $(2m_k \times 2m_k)$ matrices of square block form $M_k = \begin{pmatrix} A_k & B_k \\ C_k & D_k \end{pmatrix}$ for $k = 1, 2$, as in [21], the $\diamond$-product (or symplectic direct product) of M_1 and M_2 is defined by the following $(2(m_1 + m_2) \times 2(m_1 + m_2))$ matrix $M_1 \diamond M_2$:

$$M_1 \diamond M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & 0 & B_2 \\ C_1 & 0 & D_1 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & 0 & D_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We denote by $M^{\diamond k}$ the k-times self $\diamond$-product of M for any $k \in \mathbf{N}$.

It is easy to see that

$$N_{m_1+m_2}(M_1 \diamond M_2)^{-1}N_{m_1+m_2}(M_1 \diamond M_2) = (N_{m_1}M_1^{-1}N_{m_1}M_1) \diamond (N_{m_2}M_2^{-1}N_{m_2}M_2).$$

A special path ξ_n is defined by

$$\xi_n(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 - \frac{t}{\tau} & 0 \\ 0 & (2 - \frac{t}{\tau})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond n}, \qquad \forall t \in [0, \tau].$$

Definition 2.1. *For any* $\omega \in \mathbf{U}$ *and* $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$, *define*

$$\nu_\omega(M) = \dim_{\mathbf{C}} \ker(M - \omega I_{2n}). \tag{2.2}$$

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, *define*

$$\nu_\omega(\gamma) = \nu_\omega(\gamma(\tau)). \tag{2.3}$$

If $\gamma(\tau) \notin \mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega$, *we define*

$$i_\omega(\gamma) = [\mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega : \gamma * \xi_n], \tag{2.4}$$

where the right-hand side of (3.59) is the usual homotopy intersection number and the orientation of $\gamma * \xi_n$ *is its positive time direction under homotopy with fixed endpoints. when* $\omega = 1$ *we will write* $i_1(\gamma)$ *as* $i(\gamma)$ *in convenience. If* $\gamma(\tau) \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega$, *we let* $\mathcal{F}(\gamma)$ *be the set of all open neighborhoods of* γ *in* $\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, *and define*

$$i_\omega(\gamma) = \sup_{U \in \mathcal{F}(\gamma)} \inf\{i_\omega(\beta) | \, \beta(\tau) \in U \, \mathrm{and} \, \beta(\tau) \notin \mathrm{Sp}(2n)^0_\omega\}. \tag{2.5}$$

The index pair $(i_\omega(\gamma), \nu_\omega(\gamma)) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \{0, 1, ..., 2n\}$, which is called the index function of γ at ω, was first defined in a different way by Y. Long in [20](see also [21] and [22]).

For any $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ we define

$$\Omega(M) = \{P \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n) \quad | \quad \sigma(P) \cap \mathbf{U} = \sigma(M) \cap \mathbf{U} \\ \text{and}\, \nu_\lambda(P) = \nu_\lambda(M), \quad \forall \lambda \in \sigma(M) \cap \mathbf{U}\}, \tag{2.6}$$

where we denote by $\sigma(P)$ the spectrum of P.

We denote by $\Omega^0(M)$ the path connected component of $\Omega(M)$ containing M, and call it the *homotopy component* of M in $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$.

Definition 2.2. *For any M_1,$M_2 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$, we call $M_1 \approx M_2$ if $M_1 \in \Omega^0(M_2)$.*

Remark 2.1. It is easy to check that $\approx$ is an equivalent relation. If $M_1 \approx M_2$, we have $M_1^k \approx M_2^k$ for any $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and $M_1 \diamond M_3 \approx M_2 \diamond M_4$ for $M_3 \approx M_4$. Also we have $M_1 \diamond M_2 \approx M_2 \diamond M_1$ and $PMP^{-1} \approx M$ for any $P, M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$. By Theorem 7.8 of [20], $M_1 \diamond M_2 \approx M_1 \diamond M_3$ if and only if $M_2 \approx M_3$.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume $M_1 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2(k_1 + k_2))$ and $M_2 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k_3)$ have the following block form $M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & B_1 & B_2 \\ A_3 & A_4 & B_3 & B_4 \\ C_1 & C_2 & D_1 & D_2 \\ C_3 & C_4 & D_3 & D_4 \end{pmatrix}$ and $M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_5 & B_5 \\ C_5 & D_5 \end{pmatrix}$ with $A_1, B_1, C_1, D_1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}^{k_1})$, $A_4, B_4, C_4, D_4 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}^{k_1})$, $A_5, D_5 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{R}^{k_3})$. Let $M_3 = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & A_2 & B_1 & 0 & B_2 \\ 0 & A_5 & 0 & 0 & B_5 & 0 \\ A_3 & 0 & A_4 & B_3 & 0 & B_4 \\ C_1 & 0 & C_2 & D_1 & 0 & D_2 \\ 0 & C_5 & 0 & 0 & D_5 & 0 \\ C_3 & 0 & C_4 & D_3 & 0 & D_4 \end{pmatrix}$. Then*

$$M_3 \approx M_1 \diamond M_2. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. Let $P = \mathrm{diag}\left(\begin{pmatrix} I_{k_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{k_2} \\ 0 & I_{k_3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} I_{k_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{k_2} \\ 0 & I_{k_3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$. It is east to verify that $P \in \mathrm{Sp}(2(k_1 + k_2 + k_3))$ and $M_3 = P(M_1 \diamond M_2)P^{-1}$. Then (2.7) holds from Remark 2.1 and the proof of Lemma 2.1 is complete. ∎

The following symplectic matrices were introduced as *basic normal forms* in [21]:

$$D(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \lambda = \pm 2,$$

$$N_1(\lambda,b)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}\lambda & b\\ 0 & \lambda\end{array}\right), \qquad \lambda=\pm 1,\ b=\pm 1,\ 0,$$

$$R(\theta)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}\cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta)\\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta)\end{array}\right), \qquad \theta\in(0,\pi)\cup(\pi,2\pi),$$

$$N_2(\omega,b)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}R(\theta) & b\\ 0 & R(\theta)\end{array}\right), \qquad \theta\in(0,\pi)\cup(\pi,2\pi),$$

where $b=\left(\begin{array}{cc}b_1 & b_2\\ b_3 & b_4\end{array}\right)$ with $b_i\in\mathbf{R}$ and $b_2\neq b_3$.

For any $M\in\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ and $\omega\in\mathbf{U}$, *splitting number* of M at ω is defined by

$$S_M^{\pm}(\omega)=\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} i_{\omega\exp(\pm\sqrt{-1}\epsilon)}(\gamma)-i_\omega(\gamma)$$

for any path $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ satisfying $\gamma(\tau)=M$.

Splitting numbers possesses the following properties.

Lemma 2.2. ([20], Lemma 9.1.5 and List 9.1.12 of [21]) *Splitting number $S_M^{\pm}(\omega)$ are well defined, i.e., they are independent of the choice of the path $\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ satisfying $\gamma(\tau)=M$. For $\omega\in\mathbf{U}$ and $M\in\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$, $S_Q^{\pm}(\omega)=S_M^{\pm}(\omega)$ if $Q\approx M$. Moreover we have*

(1) $(S_M^+(\pm 1),S_M^-(\pm 1))=(1,1)$ for $M=\pm N_1(1,b)$ with $b=1$ or 0;

(2) $(S_M^+(\pm 1),S_M^-(\pm 1))=(0,0)$ for $M=\pm N_1(1,b)$ with $b=-1$;

(3) $(S_M^+(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}),S_M^-(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta}))=(0,1)$ for $M=R(\theta)$ with $\theta\in(0,\pi)\cup(\pi,2\pi)$;

*(4) $(S_M^+(\omega),S_M^-(\omega))=(0,0)$ for $\omega\in\mathbf{U}\setminus\mathbf{R}$ and $M=N_2(\omega,b)$ is **trivial** i.e., for sufficiently small $\alpha>0$, $MR((t-1)\alpha)^{\diamond n}$ possesses no eigenvalues on $\mathbf{U}$ for $t\in[0,1)$.*

*(5) $(S_M^+(\omega),S_M^-(\omega)=(1,1)$ for $\omega\in\mathbf{U}\setminus\mathbf{R}$ and $M=N_2(\omega,b)$ is **non-trivial**.*

(6) $(S_M^+(\omega),S_M^-(\omega)=(0,0)$ for any $\omega\in\mathbf{U}$ and $M\in\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ with $\sigma(M)\cap\mathbf{U}=\emptyset$.

(7) $S_{M_1\diamond M_2}^{\pm}(\omega)=S_{M_1}^{\pm}(\omega)+S_{M_2}^{\pm}(\omega)$, for any $M_j\in\mathrm{Sp}(2n_j)$ with $j=1,2$ and $\omega\in\mathbf{U}$.

Let

$$F=\mathbf{R}^{2n}\oplus\mathbf{R}^{2n} \tag{2.8}$$

possess the standard inner product. We define the symplectic structure of F by

$$\{v,w\}=(\mathcal{J}v,w),\ \forall v,w\in F,\ \text{where } \mathcal{J}=(-J)\oplus J=\left(\begin{array}{cc}-J & 0\\ 0 & J\end{array}\right). \tag{2.9}$$

We denote by $\mathrm{Lag}(F)$ the set of Lagrangian subspaces of F, and equip it with the topology as a subspace of the Grassmannian of all $2n$-dimensional subspaces of F.

It is easy to check that, for any $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ its graph

$$\mathrm{Gr}(M) \equiv \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c} x \\ Mx \end{array} \right) | x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \right\}$$

is a Lagrangian subspace of F.

Let

$$V_1 = L_0 \times L_0 = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \subset \mathbf{R}^{4n}, \tag{2.10}$$

$$V_2 = L_1 \times L_1 = \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\} \subset \mathbf{R}^{4n}. \tag{2.11}$$

By Proposition 6.1 of [25] and Lemma 2.8 and Definition 2.5 of [23], we give the following

Definition 2.3. *For any continuous path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, we define the following Maslov-type indices:*

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_1, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n, \tag{2.12}$$

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma) = \mu_F^{CLM}(V_2, \mathrm{Gr}(\gamma), [0,\tau]) - n, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\nu_{L_j}(\gamma) = \dim(\gamma(\tau)L_j \cap L_j), \qquad j = 0, 1, \tag{2.14}$$

where we denote by $i_F^{CLM}(V, W, [a,b])$ the Maslov index for Lagrangian subspace path pair (V, W) in F on $[a,b]$ defined by Cappell, Lee, and Miller in [6]. For any $M \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ and $j = 0, 1$, we also denote by $\nu_{L_j}(M) = \dim(ML_j \cap L_j)$.

The index $i_L(\gamma)$ for any Lagrangian subspace $L \subset \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and symplectic path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ was defined by the first author of this paper in [16] in a different way(see also [17] and [23]).

Definition 2.4. *For two paths γ_0, $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $j = 0, 1$, we say that they are L_j-homotopic and denoted by $\gamma_0 \sim_{L_j} \gamma_1$, if there is a map $\delta : [0,1] \to \mathcal{P}(2n)$ such that $\delta(0) = \gamma_0$ and $\delta(1) = \gamma_1$, and $\nu_{L_j}(\delta(s))$ is constant for $s \in [0,1]$.*

Lemma 2.3.([16]) *(1) If $\gamma_0 \sim_{L_j} \gamma_1$, there hold*

$$i_{L_j}(\gamma_0) = i_{L_j}(\gamma_1),\ \nu_{L_j}(\gamma_0) = \nu_{L_j}(\gamma_1).$$

(2) If $\gamma = \gamma_1 \diamond \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{P}(2n)$, and correspondingly $L_j = L_j' \oplus L_j''$, then

$$i_{L_j}(\gamma) = i_{L_j'}(\gamma_1) + i_{L_j''}(\gamma_2),\ \nu_{L_j}(\gamma) = \nu_{L_j'}(\gamma_1) + \nu_{L_j''}(\gamma_2).$$

(3) If $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(2n)$ is the fundamental solution of

$$\dot{x}(t) = JB(t)x(t)$$

with symmetric matrix function $B(t) = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}(t) & b_{12}(t) \\ b_{21}(t) & b_{22}(t) \end{pmatrix}$ *satisfying* $b_{22}(t) > 0$ *for any* $t \in R$, *then there holds*

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) = \sum_{0<s<1} \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_s),\ \gamma_s(t) = \gamma(st).$$

(4) If $b_{11}(t) > 0$ *for any* $t \in \mathbf{R}$, *there holds*

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma) = \sum_{0<s<1} \nu_{L_1}(\gamma_s),\ \gamma_s(t) = \gamma(st).$$

Definition 2.5. *For any* $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau$ *and* $k \in \mathbf{N} \equiv \{1, 2, ...\}$, *in this paper the k-time iteration* γ^k *of* $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ *in brake orbit boundary sense is defined by* $\tilde{\gamma}|_{[0,k\tau]}$ *with*

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma(t - 2j\tau)(N\gamma(\tau)^{-1}N\gamma(\tau))^j,\ t \in [2j\tau, (2j+1)\tau], j = 0, 1, 2, ... \\ N\gamma(2j\tau + 2\tau - t)N(N\gamma(\tau)^{-1}N\gamma(\tau))^{j+1}\ t \in [(2j+1)\tau, (2j+2)\tau], j = 0, 1, 2, ... \end{cases}$$

3 (L_0, L_1)-concavity and (ε, L_0, L_1)-signature of symplectic matrix

Definition 3.1. *For any* $P \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ *and* $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$, *we define the* (ε, L_0, L_1)*-symmetrization of* P *by*

$$M_\varepsilon(P) = P^T \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\varepsilon I_n & -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ -\cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n \end{pmatrix} P + \begin{pmatrix} \sin 2\varepsilon I_n & \cos 2\varepsilon I_n \\ \cos 2\varepsilon I_n & -\sin 2\varepsilon I_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

The (ε, L_0, L_1)*-signature of* P *is defined by the signature of* $M_\varepsilon(P)$. *The* (L_0, L_1)*-concavity and* $(L_0, L_1)^*$*-concavity of a symplectic path* γ *is defined by*

$$concav_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) = i_{L_0}(\gamma) - i_{L_1}(\gamma),\ \ concav^*_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) = (i_{L_0}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_0}(\gamma)) - (i_{L_1}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_1}(\gamma))$$

respectively.

In [16] it was proved that (L_0, L_1)-concavity is only depending on the end matrix $\gamma(\tau)$ of γ, and in [35] it was proved that the (L_0, L_1)-concavity of a symplectic path γ is a half of the (ε, L_0, L_1)-signature of $\gamma(\tau)$. i.e., we have the following result.

Theorem 3.1. ([35]) *For* $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2k)$ *with* $\tau > 0$, *we have*

$$concav_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)),$$

where $\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))$ *is the signature of the symmetric matrix* $M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau))$ *and* $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. *we also have,*

$$concav^*_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)),\ \ 0 < -\varepsilon \ll 1.$$

Remark 3.1. (Remark 2.1 of [35]) *For any $n_j \times n_j$ symplectic matrix P_j with $j = 1, 2$ and $n_j \in \mathbf{N}$, we have*

$$M_\varepsilon(P_1 \diamond P_2) = M_\varepsilon(P_1) \diamond M_\varepsilon(P_2),$$
$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_1 \diamond P_2) = \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_1) + \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_2),$$

where $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$.

In the rest of this section, we further develope some basic properties of the (ε, L_0, L_1)-signature and study the normal form of L_0-degenerate symplectic matrices.

Lemma 3.1. (Lemma 2.3 of [32]) *Let $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and any symplectic matrix $P = \begin{pmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ C & I_k \end{pmatrix}$. Then $P \approx I_2^{\diamond p} \diamond N_1(1,1)^{\diamond q} \diamond N_1(1,-1)^{\diamond r}$ with $p = m^0(C)$, $q = m^-(C)$, $r = m^+(C)$.*

Definition 3.2. *We call two symplectic matrices M_1 and M_2 are (L_0, L_1)-homotopic equivalent in $\mathrm{Sp}(2k)$, and denote it by $M_1 \sim M_2$, if there are $P_j \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k)$ with $P_j = \mathrm{diag}(Q_j, (Q_j^T)^{-1})$, where Q_j is a $k \times k$ invertible real matrix, and $\det(Q_j) > 0$ for $j = 1, 2$, such that*

$$M_1 = P_1 M_2 P_2.$$

Remark 3.1. Let $M_i = \begin{pmatrix} A_i & B_i \\ C_i & D_i \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k_i)$, $i = 0, 1, 2$ and $M_1 \sim M_2$($k_1 = k_2$ in this time), then $A_1^T C_1$, $B_1^T D_1$ are congruent to $A_2^T C_2$, $B_2^T D_2$ respectively. So $m^*(A_1^T C_1) = m^*(A_2^T C_2)$ and $m^*(B_1^T D_1) = m^*(B_2^T D_2)$ for $* = \pm,\ 0$. Furthermore, if $M_0 = M_1 \diamond M_2$(here $k_1 = k_2$ is not necessary), then

$$m^*(A_0^T C_0) = m^*(A_1^T C_1) + m^*(A_2^T C_2), \quad m^*(B_0^T D_0) = m^*(B_1^T D_1) + m^*(B_2^T D_2). \tag{3.1}$$

So $m^*(A^T C)$ and $m^*(B^T D)$ are (L_0, L_1)-homotopic invariant. The following formula will be used frequently

$$N_k M_1^{-1} N_k M_1 = I_{2k} + 2 \begin{pmatrix} B_1^T C_1 & B_1^T D_1 \\ A_1^T C_1 & C_1^T B_1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.2}$$

It is clear that $\sim$ is an equivalent relation and we have the following

Lemma 3.2. (Lemma 2.4 of [32]) *For M_1, $M_2 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k)$, if $M_1 \sim M_2$, then*

$$\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(M_1) = \mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(M_2), \quad 0 \le |\varepsilon| \ll 1,$$
$$N_k M_1^{-1} N_k M_1 \approx N_k M_2^{-1} N_k M_2.$$

By results in [32, 33, 35], we have the following lemmas 3.3-3.5 which will be used frequently in Section 4.

Lemma 3.3. (Lemma 2.5 of [32]) *Assume* $P = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k)$, *where* A, B, C, D *are all* $k \times k$ *matrices.*

(i) Let $q = \max\{m^+(A^TC), m^+(B^TD)\}$, *we have*

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(P) \le k - q - \nu_{L_1}(P), \quad 0 < -\varepsilon \ll 1,$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(P) \le k - q - \nu_{L_0}(P), \quad 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1.$$

(ii) If both B *and* C *are invertible, we have*

$$\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(P) = \mathrm{sgn}M_0(P), \quad 0 \le |\varepsilon| \ll 1.$$

Lemma 3.4. ([35]) *For* $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2)$, $b > 0$, *and* $\varepsilon > 0$ *small enough we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{sgn}M_{\pm\varepsilon}(R(\theta)) = 0, \quad \text{for } \theta \in \mathbf{R}, \\
&\mathrm{sgn}M_{\pm\varepsilon}(P) = 0, \quad \text{if } P = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & 1/a \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } a \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0\}, \\
&\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(P) = 0, \quad \text{if } P = \pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -b & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
&\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(P) = 2, \quad \text{if } P = \pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
&\mathrm{sgn}M_\varepsilon(P) = -2, \quad \text{if } P = \pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ b & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.5. (Lemma 2.9 of [33]) *Let* $2k \times 2k$ *symmetric real matrix* E *have the following block form* $E = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E_1 \\ E_1^T & E_2 \end{pmatrix}$. *Then*

$$m^\pm(E) \ge \mathrm{rank}E_1. \tag{3.3}$$

In the following we prove Lemma 3.6, which will be used to prove Lemma 3.7 while Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8 are two key lemmas in this paper.

Lemma 3.6. *Let A_1 and A_3 be $k \times k$ real matrices. Assume both A_1 and A_1A_3 are symmetric and $\sigma(A_3) \subset (-\infty, 0)$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{sgn} A_1 + \mathrm{sgn}(A_1A_3) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. It is clear that A_3 is invertible. We prove Lemma 3.6 by the following two steps.

Step 1. We prove this lemma in the case A_1 is invertible by mathematical induction for $k \in \mathbf{N}$.

If $k = 1$, then $A_1, A_3 \in \mathbf{R}$ and (3.4) holds obviously. Now assume (3.4) holds for $1 \leq k \leq l$. If we can prove (3.4) for $k = l+1$, then by the mathematical induction (3.4) holds for any $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and Lemma 3.6 is proved in the case A_1 is invertible.

By the real Jordan canonical form decomposition of A_3, in Step 1 we only need to prove (3.4) for $k = l+1$ in the following Case 1 and Case 2.

Case 1. There is an invertible $(l+1) \times (l+1)$ real matrix such that $Q^{-1}A_3Q$ is the $(l+1)$-order Jordan form $\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix} := \tilde{A}_3$ with $\lambda < 0$.

Denote by $\tilde{A}_1 = Q^T A_1 Q$. We have

$$\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{A}_3 = Q^T A_1 Q\, Q^{-1} A_3 Q = Q^T A_1 A_3 Q.$$

So both $\tilde{A}_1$ and $\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3$ are symmetric and we have

$$\mathrm{sgn} A_1 + \mathrm{sgn}(A_1A_3) = \mathrm{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 + \mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3). \tag{3.5}$$

Denote by $\tilde{A}_1 = (a_{i,j})$, where $a_{i,j}$ is the element on the i-th row and j-th column of $\tilde{A}_1$ for $1 \leq i,j \leq l+1$. We denote by $\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3 = (c_{i,j})$ in the same sense. Then we have $a_{i,j} = a_{j.i}$ and $c_{i,j} = c_{j,i}$ for $1 \leq i,j \leq l+1$.

Claim 3.1. In Case 1 $a_{i,j} = 0$ for $i+j \leq l+1$ and $a_{i,j} = a_{l+1,1}$ for $i+j = l+2$ with $1 \leq i,j \leq l+1$.

For $2 \leq j \leq l+1$, since $c_{1,j} = c_{j,1}$ we have

$$\lambda a_{1,j} + a_{1,j-1} = \lambda a_{j,1} = \lambda a_{1,j}.$$

So we have

$$a_{1,j-1} = 0, \quad 2 \leq j \leq l+1. \tag{3.6}$$

For $2 \leq i, j \leq l+1$, since $c_{i,j} = c_{j,i}$ we have

$$\lambda a_{i,j} + a_{i,j-1} = \lambda a_{j,i} + a_{j,i-1} = \lambda a_{i,j} + a_{i-1,j}.$$

So we have

$$a_{i,j-1} = a_{i-1,j}, \quad 2 \leq i, j \leq l+1. \tag{3.7}$$

By (3.6) and (3.7) we have

$$a_{i,j} = a_{i-1,j+1} = \cdots = a_{2,i+j-2} = a_{1,i+j-1} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i, j \text{ and } i+j \leq l+1, \tag{3.8}$$

$$a_{l+1,1} = a_{l,2} = a_{l-1,3} = \cdots = a_{2,l} = a_{1,l+1}. \tag{3.9}$$

Then Claim 3.1 holds from (3.8) and (3.9).

By Claim 3.1, let $a = a_{1,l+1}$ we have

$$\tilde{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & a & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & a & * & * & * & * & * \\ a & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda a & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & \lambda a & * & * & * & * & * \\ \lambda a & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.10}$$

Then it is easy to see that $\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3$ is congruent to $\lambda\tilde{A}_1$. So since $\lambda < 0$ we have

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) = \operatorname{sgn}(\lambda\tilde{A}_1) = -\operatorname{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1).$$

Hence we have

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) + \operatorname{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

Then (3.4) holds from (3.5) and (3.11). So in Case 1 (3.4) holds for $k = l+1$.

Case 2. There exists a invertible $(l+1)\times(l+1)$ real matrix Q such that $Q^{-1}A_3Q = \operatorname{diag}(A_4, A_5)$, where A_4 is a $k_1 \times k_1$ real matrix with $\sigma(A_4) \subset (-\infty, 0)$ and A_5 is a k_2-order Jordan form

$$A_5 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\lambda < 0$, $1 \le k_1, k_2 \le l$ and $k_1 + k_2 = l + 1$.

We still denote by $\tilde{A}_1 = Q^T A_1 Q$, then

$$\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{A}_3 = Q^T A_1 Q\, Q^{-1} A_3 Q = Q^T A_1 A_3 Q.$$

So both $\tilde{A}_1$ and $\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{A}_3$ are symmetric and we have

$$\mathrm{sgn} A_1 + \mathrm{sgn}(A_1 A_3) = \mathrm{sgn} \tilde{A}_1 + \mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{A}_3). \tag{3.12}$$

Correspondingly we can write $\tilde{A}_1$ in the block form decomposition $\tilde{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} E_1 & E_2 \\ E_2^T & E_4 \end{pmatrix}$, where E_1 is a $k_1 \times k_1$ real symmetric matric and E_4 is a $k_2 \times k_2$ real symmetric matrix. Then

$$\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{A}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} E_1 A_4 & E_2 A_5 \\ E_2^T A_4 & E_4 A_5 \end{pmatrix}$$

is symmetric.

Subcase 1. E_4 is invertible.

In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} I_{k_1} & -E_2 E_4^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{k_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} E_1 & E_2 \\ E_2^T & E_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{k_1} & 0 \\ -E_4^{-1} E_2^T & I_{k_2} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} E_1 - E_2 E_4^{-1} E_2^T & 0 \\ 0 & E_4 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} I_{k_1} & -E_2 E_4^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{k_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} E_1 A_4 & E_2 A_5 \\ E_2^T A_4 & E_4 A_5 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{k_1} & 0 \\ -E_4^{-1} E_2^T & I_{k_2} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} E_1 A_4 - E_2 E_4^{-1} E_2^T A_4 & 0 \\ 0 & E_4 A_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (E_1 - E_2 E_4^{-1} E_2^T) A_4 & 0 \\ 0 & E_4 A_5 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Since $\tilde{A}_1$ is symmetric and invertible, by (3.13) we have $E_1 - E_2 E_4^{-1} E_2^T$ is symmetric and invertible. Since $\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{A}_3$ is symmetric and invertible, by 3.14) we have $(E_1 - E_2 E_4^{-1} E_2^T) A_4$ is symmetric and invertible. Since $1 \le k_1 \le l$ and $\sigma(A_4) \subset (-\infty, 0)$, by our induction hypothesis we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}((E_1 - E_2 E_4^{-1} E_2^T) A_4) + \mathrm{sgn}(E_1 - E_2 E_4^{-1} E_2^T) = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

By (3.14) we also have E_4A_5 is symmetric. Since E_4 is symmetric and invertible, $\sigma(A_5) = \{\lambda\} \subset (-\infty, 0)$ and $1 \le k_2 \le l$, by our induction hypothesis we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(E_4A_5) + \mathrm{sgn}E_4 = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

By (3.13) we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 = \mathrm{sgn}(E_1 - E_2E_4^{-1}E_2^T) + \mathrm{sgn}E_4. \tag{3.17}$$

By (3.14) we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) = \mathrm{sgn}((E_1 - E_2E_4^{-1}E_2^T)A_4) + \mathrm{sgn}(E_4A_5). \tag{3.18}$$

Then by (3.15)-(3.18) we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) + \mathrm{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 = 0. \tag{3.19}$$

Then (3.4) holds from (3.12) and (3.19).

Subcase 2. E_4 is not invertible.

In this case we define k_2-order real invertible matrix

$$E_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then it is easy to verify that E_0A_5 is symmetric and $E_4 + \varepsilon E_0$ is invertible for $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Define $A_\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} E_1 & E_2 \\ E_2^T & E_4 + \varepsilon E_0 \end{pmatrix}$. Since $\tilde{A}_1$ and $\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3$ are invertible, we have both A_ε and $A_\varepsilon\tilde{A}_3$ are symmetric and invertible. So we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 = \mathrm{sgn}A_\varepsilon, \quad \mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) = \mathrm{sgn}(A_\varepsilon\tilde{A}_3), \quad \text{for } 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1. \tag{3.20}$$

By the proof of Subcase 1, we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(A_\varepsilon\tilde{A}_3) + \mathrm{sgn}A_\varepsilon = 0. \tag{3.21}$$

So by (3.20) we have

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) + \operatorname{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 = 0. \tag{3.22}$$

Then (3.4) holds from (3.22).

So in Case 2 (3.4) holds for $k = l+1$. Hence in the case A_1 is invertible Lemma 3.6.holds and Step 1 is finished.

Step 2. We prove (3.4) in the case A_1 is not invertible.

If $A_1 = 0$, (3.4) holds obviously.

If $1 \le \operatorname{rank}A_1 = m \le k-1$, there is a real orthogonal matrix G such that

$$G^T A_1 G = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{A}_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.23}$$

where $\hat{A}_1$ is a m-order invertible real symmetric matrix. Correspondingly we write

$$G^{-1} A_3 G = \begin{pmatrix} F_1 & F_2 \\ F_3 & F_4 \end{pmatrix},$$

where F_1 is a $(k-m)\times(k-m)$ real matrix and F_4 is a $m \times m$ real matrix.

Since A_1A_3 is symmetric, we have

$$G^T A_1 A_3 G = G^T A_1 G G^{-1} A_3 G = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \hat{A}_1 F_3 & \hat{A}_1 F_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

is still symmetric. So we have $\hat{A}_1 F_2^T = 0$, since $\hat{A}_1$ is invertible we have $F_3 = 0$. Then

$$G^{-1} A_3 G = \begin{pmatrix} F_1 & F_2 \\ 0 & F_4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.24}$$

So we have

$$G^T A_1 A_3 G^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{A}_1 F_4 \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.25}$$

and $\hat{A}_1 F_4$ is symmetric. Also by (3.24) we have F_4 is invertible and $\sigma(F_4) \subset (-\infty, 0)$. So by the proof of the case A_1 is invertible we have

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\hat{A}_1 F_4) + \operatorname{sgn}\hat{A}_1 = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

By (3.23) and (3.25) we have

$$\operatorname{sgn}(A_1 A_3) + \operatorname{sgn}A_1 = \operatorname{sgn}(\hat{A}_1 F_4) + \operatorname{sgn}\hat{A}_1. \tag{3.27}$$

Then (3.4) holds from (3.26) and (3.27). Hence (3.4) holds in the case A_1 is not invertible. Step 2 is finished.

By Step 1 and Step 2 Lemma 3.6 holds. ∎

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $R = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & I_k \\ A_3 & A_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k)$ *with* A_3 *being invertible. If* $e(N_k R^{-1} N_k R) = 2m$, *where* $0 \leq m \leq k$ *and the elliptic hight* $e(P)$ *of* P *is the total algebraic multiplicity of all eigenvalues of* P *on* $\mathbf{U}$ *for any* $P \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n)$. *Then we have*

$$m - k \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(R) \leq k - m, \qquad 0 \leq |\varepsilon| \ll 1. \tag{3.28}$$

Proof. Since $e(N_k R^{-1} N_k R) = 2m$, there exists a symplectic matrix $P \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k)$ such that

$$P^{-1}(N_k R^{-1} N_k R)P = Q_1 \diamond Q_2 \tag{3.29}$$

with $\sigma(Q_1) \in \mathbf{U}$, $\sigma(Q_2) \cap \mathbf{U} = \emptyset$, $Q_1 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2m)$, and $Q_2 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k-2m)$. By (ii) of Lemma 3.3, since A_3 is invertible we only need to prove (3.28) for $\varepsilon = 0$.

Step 1. We first prove (3.28) in the case A_1 is invertible.

Since R is a symplectic matrix we have $R^T J_k R = J_k$. Then $A_1^T A_3$ and A_2 are all symmetric matrices and

$$A_1^T A_2 - A_3^T = I_k.$$

Since R^T is also a symplectic matrix we have $R J_k R^T = J_k$. Then A_1 is symmetric. Hence $A_1 A_3$ is symmetric and

$$A_1 A_2 - A_3^T = I_k. \tag{3.30}$$

By definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_0(R) &= R^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_k \\ -I_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} R + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_k \\ I_k & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -2 \begin{pmatrix} A_1 A_3 & A_3^T \\ A_3 & A_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Since A_1 is invertible, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ -A_1^{-1} & I_k \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 A_3 & A_3^T \\ A_3 & A_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_k & -A_1^{-1} \\ 0 & I_k \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} A_1A_3 & 0 \\ 0 & -A_1^{-1}A_3^T + A_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} A_1A_3 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.32}$$

where in the last equality we have used the equality (3.30). So by (3.32) we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}M_0(R) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn}\begin{pmatrix} A_1A_3 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.33}$$

By the Jordan canonical form decomposition of complex matrix, there exists a complex invertible k-order matrix G_1 such that

$$G_1^{-1}A_3G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & * & * & * & * \\ 0 & u_2 & * & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & u_{k-1} & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & u_k \end{pmatrix}$$

with $u_1, u_2, ..., u_k \in \mathbf{C}$.

By (3.2) we have

$$N_kR^{-1}N_kR = I_{2k} + 2\begin{pmatrix} A_3 & A_2 \\ A_1A_3 & A_3^T \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.34}$$

Since

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ -A_1 & I_k \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} A_3 & A_2 \\ A_1A_3 & A_3^T \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ A_1 & I_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_k + 2A_3 & A_2 \\ -A_1 & -I_k \end{pmatrix},$$

by (3.34) we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ A_1 & I_k \end{pmatrix}^{-1}(N_kR^{-1}N_kR)\begin{pmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ A_1 & I_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 3I_k + 4A_3 & 2A_2 \\ -2A_1 & -I_k \end{pmatrix} := R_1. \tag{3.35}$$

By (3.35), for any $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}$ we have

$$\lambda I_{2k} - R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} (\lambda - 3)I_k - 4A_3 & -2A_2 \\ 2A_1 & (\lambda + 1)I_k \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.36}$$

Since A_1 is invertible, by (3.30) we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_k & -\frac{1}{2}((\lambda-3)I_k-4A_3)A_1^{-1} \\ 0 & I_k \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} (\lambda-3)I_k-4A_3 & -2A_2 \\ 2A_1 & (\lambda+1)I_k \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2}((\lambda^2-2\lambda+1)I_k-4\lambda A_3)A_1^{-1} \\ 2A_1 & (\lambda+1)I_k \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.37}$$

Then by (3.36)-(3.37) we have

$$\det(\lambda I_{2k}-R_1)=\det((\lambda^2-2\lambda+1)I_k-4\lambda A_3). \tag{3.38}$$

Denote by $u_1, u_2, ..., u_k$ the k complex eigenvalues of A_3, by (3.38) we have

$$\det(\lambda I_{2k}-R_1)=\Pi_{i=1}^k(\lambda^2-2\lambda+1-4\lambda u_i)=\Pi_{i=1}^k(\lambda^2-(2+4u_i)\lambda+1). \tag{3.39}$$

So by (3.35) and (3.39) we have

$$\det(\lambda I_{2k}-N_kR^{-1}N_kR)=\Pi_{i=1}^k(\lambda^2-2\lambda+1-4\lambda u_i)=\Pi_{i=1}^k(\lambda^2-(2+4u_i)\lambda+1). \tag{3.40}$$

It is easy to check that the equation $\lambda^2-(2+u_i)\lambda+1=0$ has two solutions on $\mathbf{U}$ if and only if $-4\le u_i\le 0$ for $i=1,2,3...,k$. So by (3.29) without loss of generality we assume $u_j\in[-4,0)$ for $1\le j\le m$ and $u_j\notin[-4,0)$ for $m+1\le j\le k$. Then there exists a real invertible matrix k-order Q such that

$$Q^{-1}A_3Q=\begin{pmatrix} A_4 & 0 \\ 0 & A_5 \end{pmatrix}:=\tilde{A}_3$$

and $\sigma(A_4)\subset[-4,0)$, $\sigma(A_5)\cap[-4,0)=\emptyset$, where A_4 is an m-order real invertible matrix and A_5 is a $(k-m)$-order real matrix.

Denote by $\tilde{A}_1=Q^TA_1Q$. We have

$$\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3=Q^TA_1Q\,Q^{-1}A_3Q=Q^TA_1A_3Q.$$

So both $\tilde{A}_1$ and $\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3$ are symmetric and we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}A_1+\mathrm{sgn}(A_1A_3)=\mathrm{sgn}\tilde{A}_1+\mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3). \tag{3.41}$$

Correspondingly we can write $\tilde{A}_1$ in the block form decomposition $\tilde{A}_1=\begin{pmatrix} E_1 & E_2 \\ E_2^T & E_4 \end{pmatrix}$, where E_1 is an m-order real symmetric matric and E_4 is a $(k-m)$-order real symmetric matrix. Then

$$\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3=\begin{pmatrix} E_1A_4 & E_2A_5 \\ E_2^TA_4 & E_4A_5 \end{pmatrix}$$

is symmetric.

By the same argument of the proof of Subcase 2 of Lemma 3.6 without loss of generality we can assume E_1 is invertible(Otherwise we can perturb it slightly such that it is invertible). So as in Subcase 1 of the proof of Lemma 3.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} I_m & 0 \\ -E_2^T E_1^{-1} & I_{k-m} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} E_1 & E_2 \\ E_2^T & E_4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & -E_1^{-1}E_2 \\ 0 & I_{k-m} \end{pmatrix} \\ = &\begin{pmatrix} E_1 & 0 \\ 0 & E_4 - E_2^T E_1^{-1} E_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} I_m & 0 \\ -E_2^T E_1^{-1} & I_{k-m} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} E_1 A_4 & E_2 A_5 \\ E_2^T A_4 & E_4 A_5 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_m & -E_1^{-1}E_2 \\ 0 & I_{k-m} \end{pmatrix} \\ = &\begin{pmatrix} E_1 A_4 & 0 \\ 0 & (E_4 - E_2^T E_1^{-1} E_2) A_5 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

By (3.43) we also have E_1A_4 is symmetric. Since E_1 is symmetric and invertible, $\sigma(A_4) \subset [-4, 0)$, by Lemma 3.6 we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(E_1A_4) + \mathrm{sgn}E_1 = 0. \tag{3.44}$$

By (3.42) we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 = \mathrm{sgn}(E_4 - E_2^T E_1^{-1} E_2) + \mathrm{sgn}E_1. \tag{3.45}$$

By (3.43) we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) = \mathrm{sgn}((E_4 - E_2^T E_1^{-1} E_2)A_5) + \mathrm{sgn}(E_1A_4). \tag{3.46}$$

Then by (3.44)-(3.46) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{sgn}(\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_3) + \mathrm{sgn}\tilde{A}_1 \\ &= \mathrm{sgn}((E_4 - E_2^T E_1^{-1} E_2)A_5) + \mathrm{sgn}(E_4 - E_2^T E_1^{-1} E_2) \in [-2(k-m), 2(k-m)]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

Then (3.28) holds from (3.33), (3.41) and (3.47).

Step 2. We prove (3.28) in the case A_1 is not invertible.

If $A_1 = 0$, then $A_3 = -I_k$ and $m = k$. It is easy to check that $M_0(R) = 2\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_k \\ I_k & -A_2 \end{pmatrix}$ is congruent to $2\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_k \\ I_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, so $\mathrm{sgn}M_0(R) = 0$, (3.28) holds.

If $1 \leq \mathrm{rank} A_1 = r \leq k-1$, there is a $k\times k$ invertible matrix G with $\det G > 0$ such that

$$(G^{-1})^T A_1 G^{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(0, \Lambda), \tag{3.48}$$

where Λ is a $r\times r$ real invertible matrix. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diag}((G^T)^{-1}, G)\cdot R\cdot \mathrm{diag}(G^{-1}, G^T) &= \begin{pmatrix} (G^T)^{-1}A_1G^{-1} & I_k \\ GA_3G^{-1} & GA_2G^T \end{pmatrix} \\ &:= R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{k-r} & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda & 0 & I_r \\ B_1 & B_2 & D_1 & D_2 \\ B_3 & B_4 & D_3 & D_4 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

where B_1 and D_1 are $(k-r)\times(k-r)$ matrices and B_4 and D_4 are $r\times r$ matrices.

Then since R_2 is symplectic and Λ is invertible, we have $R_2^T J_k R_2 = J_k$ which implies that $B_3 = 0$, $D_3 = D_2^T$, $B_1 = -I_{k-r}$, and D_1, D_4 are symmetric. So we have

$$R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{k-r} & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda & 0 & I_r \\ B_1 & B_2 & D_1 & D_2 \\ 0 & B_4 & D_2^T & D_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

For $t\in[0,1]$, we define

$$\beta(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{k-r} & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda & 0 & I_r \\ B_1 & tB_2 & tD_1 & tD_2 \\ 0 & B_4 & tD_2^T & D_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then it is easy to check that β is a symplectic path and $\nu_{L_j}(\beta(t) = 0$ for all $t\in[0,1]$ and $j = 0, 1$. Also we have $\beta(1) = R_2$ and

$$\beta(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_{k-r} & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda & 0 & I_r \\ B_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_4 & 0 & D_4 \end{pmatrix} = -J_{k-r} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & I_r \\ B_4 & D_4 \end{pmatrix} := R_3.$$

Then by Lemma 2.2 of [35], Lemma 3.4, and Remark 3.1 we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_0(R_2) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_0(-J_{k-r}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_0\left(\begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & I_r \\ B_4 & D_4 \end{pmatrix}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_0\left(\left(\begin{array}{cc}\Lambda & I_r\\ B_4 & D_4\end{array}\right)\right). \tag{3.50}$$

Since $R_2 \sim R$, by (3.50) we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_0(R) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_0\left(\left(\begin{array}{cc}\Lambda & I_r\\ B_4 & D_4\end{array}\right)\right). \tag{3.51}$$

By (3.2) we have

$$N_kR_2^{-1}N_kR_2 = I_{2k} + 2\left(\begin{array}{cccc}B_1 & B_2 & D_1 & D_2\\ 0 & B_4 & D_2^T & D_4\\ 0 & 0 & B_1^T & 0\\ 0 & \Lambda B_4 & B_2^T & B_4^T\end{array}\right). \tag{3.52}$$

By (3.52) for any $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \det(\lambda I_{2k} - N_kR_2^{-1}N_kR_2)\\ = \;& \det((\lambda-1)I_{k-r} - 2B_1)\det((\lambda-1)I_{k-r} - 2B_1^T)\cdot\\ & \cdot\det\left(\begin{array}{cc}(\lambda-1)I_r - 2B_4 & -2D_4\\ -2\Lambda B_4 & (\lambda-1)I_r - 2B_4^T\end{array}\right)\\ = \;& \det(\lambda I_{2k} - N_kR_3^{-1}N_kR_3), \end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

where

$$N_kR_3^{-1}N_kR_3 = I_{2k} + 2\left(\begin{array}{cccc}B_1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & B_4 & 0 & D_4\\ 0 & 0 & B_1^T & 0\\ 0 & \Lambda B_4 & 0 & B_4^T\end{array}\right).$$

So by (3.53) we have

$$\sigma(N_kR^{-1}N_kR) = \sigma(N_kR_2^{-1}N_kR_2) = \sigma(N_kR_3^{-1}N_kR_3). \tag{3.54}$$

Since $B_1 = -I_{k-r}$ and $R_3 = (-J_{k-r}) \diamond \left(\begin{array}{cc}\Lambda & I_r\\ B_4 & D_4\end{array}\right)$, by (3.54) we have

$$e\left(N_r\left(\begin{array}{cc}\Lambda & I_r\\ B_4 & D_4\end{array}\right)^{-1}N_r\left(\begin{array}{cc}\Lambda & I_r\\ B_4 & D_4\end{array}\right)\right) = 2(m-(k-r)). \tag{3.55}$$

So by step 1 we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\left|\operatorname{sgn} M_0\left(\left(\begin{array}{cc}\Lambda & I_r\\ B_4 & D_4\end{array}\right)\right)\right| \le r-(m-(k-r))=k-m. \tag{3.56}$$

Then (3.28) holds form (3.51) and (3.56). Thus Step 2 is finished.

By Step 1 and Step 2, Lemma 3.7 holds. ∎

The following result is about the (L_0, L_1)-normal form of L_0-degenerate symplectic matrices which generalizes Lemma 2.10 of [33].

Lemma 3.8. *Let $R \in \mathrm{Sp}(2k)$ has the block form $R=\left(\begin{array}{cc}A & B\\ C & D\end{array}\right)$ with $1 \le \operatorname{rank} B = r < k$. We have*

(i) $R \sim \left(\begin{array}{cccc}A_1 & B_1 & I_r & 0\\ 0 & D_1 & 0 & 0\\ A_3 & B_3 & A_2 & 0\\ C_3 & D_3 & C_2 & D_2\end{array}\right)$, where A_1, A_2, A_3 are $r\times r$ matrices, D_1, D_2, D_3 are $(k-r)\times(k-r)$ matrices, B_1, B_3 are $r\times(k-r)$ matrices, and C_2, C_3 are $(k-r)\times r$ matrices.

(ii) If A_3 is invertible, we have

$$R \sim \left(\begin{array}{cc}A_1 & I_r\\ A_3 & A_2\end{array}\right) \diamond \left(\begin{array}{cc}D_1 & 0\\ \tilde{D}_3 & D_2\end{array}\right), \tag{3.57}$$

where $\tilde{D}_3$ is a $(k-r)\times(k-r)$ matrix.

(iii) If $1 \le \operatorname{rank} A_3 = \lambda \le r-1$, then

$$R \sim \left(\begin{array}{cc}U & I_\lambda\\ \Lambda & V\end{array}\right) \diamond \left(\begin{array}{cccc}\tilde{A}_1 & \tilde{B}_1 & I_{r-\lambda} & 0\\ 0 & D_1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \tilde{B}_3 & \tilde{A}_2 & 0\\ \tilde{C}_3 & \tilde{D}_3 & \tilde{C}_2 & \tilde{D}_2\end{array}\right), \tag{3.58}$$

where $\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2$ are $(r-\lambda)\times(r-\lambda)$ matrices, $\tilde{B}_1, \tilde{B}_3$ are $(r-\lambda)\times(k-r)$ matrices, $\tilde{C}_2, \tilde{C}_3$ are $(k-r)\times(r-\lambda)$ matrices, $D_1, \tilde{D}_2, \tilde{D}_3$ are $(k-r)\times(k-r)$ matrices, U, V, Λ are $\lambda\times\lambda$ matrices, and Λ is invertible.

(iv) If $A_3 = 0$, then A_1, A_2 are symmetric and $A_1A_2 = I_r$. Suppose $m^+(A_1) = p$, $m^-(A_1) = r-p$ and $0 \le \operatorname{rank} B_3 = \lambda \le \min\{r,\, k-r\}$, then

$$N_kR^{-1}N_kR \approx \left(\begin{array}{cc}1 & 1\\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right)^{\diamond p+q^-} \diamond \left(\begin{array}{cc}1 & -1\\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right)^{\diamond(r-p+q^+)} \diamond I_2^{\diamond q^0} \diamond D(2)^{\diamond\lambda}, \tag{3.59}$$

$$m^+(A^TC) = \lambda + q^+, \tag{3.60}$$

$$m^0(A^TC) = r - \lambda + q^0, \tag{3.61}$$

$$m^-(A^TC) = \lambda + q^-, \tag{3.62}$$

where $q^* \geq 0$ *for* $* = \pm, 0$, $q^+ + q^0 + q^- = k - r - \lambda$, *for any symplectic matrix the term* $M^{\diamond 0}$ *means it does not appear.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.10 of [33] or the same argument of the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [32], (i)-(iii) hold. So we only need to prove (3.59)-(3.62).

By (i) and $A_3 = 0$ we have

$$R \sim \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & I_r & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_3 & A_2 & 0 \\ C_3 & D_3 & C_2 & D_2 \end{pmatrix} := R_1. \tag{3.63}$$

Since R_1 is symplectic we have $R_1^T J_k R_1 = J_k$. Then we have A_1, A_2 are symmetric and $A_1 A_2 = I_r$. $D_1 D_2^T = I_{k-r}$ and $A_1^T B_3 = C_3^T D_1$. By (3.2) we have

$$N_k R_1^{-1} N_k R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I_r & 2B_3 & 2A_2 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{k-r} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2A_1^T B_3 & I_r & 0 \\ 2B_3^T A_1 & 2B_1^T B_3 + 2D_1^T D_3 & 2B_3^T & I_{k-r} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.64}$$

By Remark 3.1 we have

$$m^*(A^TC) = m^*\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_1^T B_3 \\ B_3^T A_1 & B_1^T B_3 + D_1^T D_3 \end{pmatrix}\right), \qquad * = +, -, 0. \tag{3.65}$$

Since $0 \leq \mathrm{rank} B_3 = \lambda \leq \min\{r, k-r\}$, there exist $r \times r$ and $(k-r) \times (k-r)$ real invertible matrices G_1 and G_2 such that

$$G_1 B_3 G_2 = \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} := F. \tag{3.66}$$

Note that if $\lambda = 0$ then $B_3 = 0$, if $\lambda = \min\{r, k-r\}$ then $G_1 B_3 G_2 = \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ or $\begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, if $\lambda = r = k - r$ then $G_1 B_3 G_2 = I_\lambda$. The proof below can still go through by corresponding adjustment.

By (3.66) we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_1A_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & G_2^T \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_1^TB_3 \\ B_3^TA_1 & B_1^TB_3+D_1^TD_3 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} A_1^{-1}G_1^T & 0 \\ 0 & G_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & G_1B_3G_2 \\ G_2^TB_3^TG_1^T & U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ I_\lambda & 0 & U_1 & U_2 \\ 0 & 0 & U_2^T & U_4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.67}$$

Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{r-\lambda} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}U_1 & 0 & I_\lambda & 0 \\ -U_2^T & 0 & 0 & I_{k-r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ I_\lambda & 0 & U_1 & U_2 \\ 0 & 0 & U_2^T & U_4 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 0 & -\frac{1}{2}U_1 & -U_2 \\ 0 & I_{r-\lambda} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{k-r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ I_\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & U_4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.68}$$

Set

$$q^* = m^*(U_4), \quad * = \pm, 0 \tag{3.69}$$

Then $q^+ + q^0 + q^- = k - r - \lambda$ and (3.60)-(3.62) hold from (3.65), (3.67) and (3.68).

Also by (3.68) and Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{k-r-\lambda} & 0 \\ 2U_4 & I_{k-r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond q^-} \diamond I_2^{\diamond q^0} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond q^+}. \tag{3.70}$$

By (3.67) we have

$$\mathrm{diag}((G_1^T)^{-1}A_1, G_2^{-1}, G_1A_1^{-1}, G_2^T)(N_kR_1^{-1}N_kR_1)\mathrm{diag}(A_1^{-1}G_1^T, G_2, A_1G_1^{-1}, (G_2^T)^{-1})$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} I_r & 2E & 2\tilde{A}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{k-r} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2F & I_r & 0 \\ 2F^T & 2U & 2E^T & I_{k-r} \end{pmatrix} := M, \tag{3.71}$$

where $\tilde{A}_1 = (G_1^T)^{-1}A_1G_1^{-1}$, $E = (G_1^T)^{-1}A_1B_3G_2 = \tilde{A}_1F$.

Since M is symplectic, we have $M^TJ_kM = J_k$. Then we have $E = \tilde{A}_1F$. Since $\tilde{A}_1 = (G_1^T)^{-1}A_1G_1^{-1}$, it is congruent to $\mathrm{diag}(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_r)$ with

$$a_i = 1,\ 1 \le i \le p \quad \text{and} \quad a_j = -1,\ p+1 \le j \le r \text{ for some } 0 \le p \le r. \tag{3.72}$$

Then there is an invertible $r \times r$ real matrix Q such that $\det Q > 0$ and

$$Q\tilde{A}_1Q^T = \mathrm{diag}(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_r) = \mathrm{diag}(\mathrm{diag}(a_1, a_2, ..., a_\lambda), \mathrm{diag}(a_{\lambda+1}, ..., a_r)) := \mathrm{diag}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2). \tag{3.73}$$

Since $\det Q > 0$ we can joint it to I_r by invertible continuous matrix path. So there is a continuous invertible symmetric matrix path β such that $\alpha_1(1) = \tilde{A}_1$ and $\alpha_1(0) = \mathrm{diag}(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_r)$ with

$$m^*(\alpha_1(t)) = m^*(\tilde{A}_1) = m^*(A_1), \quad t \in [0,1],\ * = +, -.$$

Define symmetric matrix path

$$\alpha_2(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 2tU_1 & 2tU_2 \\ 2tU_2^T & 2U_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [0,1].$$

For $t \in [0,1]$, define

$$\beta(t) = \begin{pmatrix} I_r & 2\alpha_1(t)F & 2\alpha_1(t) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{k-r} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2F & I_r & 0 \\ 2F^T & \alpha_2(t) & 2F^T\alpha_1(t)^T & I_{k-r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then since M is symplectic, it is easy to check that β is a continuous symplectic matrix path. Since $F = \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\alpha_1(t)$ is invertible, by direct computation, we have

$$\mathrm{rank}(\beta(t) - I_{2k}) = 2\lambda + \mathrm{rank}(\alpha_1(t)) + \mathrm{rank}(U_4) = 2\lambda + r + m^+(U_4) + m^-(U_4).$$

Hence

$$\nu_1(\beta(t)) = \nu_1(\beta(1)) = \nu_1(M), \qquad t \in [0,1].$$

Since $\sigma(\beta(t)) = \{1\}$, by Definition 2.2 and Lemma 2.1

$$M \;=\; \beta(1) \approx \beta(0)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 0 & 2\Lambda_1 & 2\Lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{r-\lambda} & 0 & 0 & 2\Lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_\lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2I_\lambda & I_\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{r-\lambda} & 0 \\ 2I_\lambda & 0 & 0 & 2\Lambda_1 & 0 & I_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} I_{k-r-\lambda} & 0 \\ 2U_4 & I_{k-r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\approx \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 2\Lambda_1 & 2\Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & I_\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2I_\lambda & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 2I_\lambda & 0 & 2\Lambda_1 & I_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} I_{r-\lambda} & 2\Lambda_2 \\ 0 & I_{r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} I_{k-r-\lambda} & 0 \\ 2U_4 & I_{k-r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 2\Lambda_1 & 2\Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & I_\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2I_\lambda & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 2I_\lambda & 0 & 2\Lambda_1 & I_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \diamond \Diamond_{j=\lambda+1}^{r} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2a_j \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} I_{k-r-\lambda} & 0 \\ 2U_4 & I_{k-r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (3.74)$$

We define continuous symplectic matrix path

$$\psi(t) = \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 2(1-t^2)\Lambda_1 & 2\Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & (1+t)I_\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2(1-t^2)I_\lambda & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 2(1-t)I_\lambda & 0 & 2(1-t)\Lambda_1 & \frac{1}{1+t}I_\lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [0,1].$$

Since Λ_1 is invertible, we have $\nu(\psi(t)) \equiv \lambda$ for $t \in [0,1]$. So by $\sigma(\psi(t)) \cap \mathbf{U} = \{1\}$ for $t \in [0,t]$ and Definition 2.2 we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & \Lambda_1 & 2\Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & I_\lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2I_\lambda & I_\lambda & 0 \\ 2I_\lambda & 0 & 2\Lambda_1 & I_\lambda \end{pmatrix} = \psi(0) \quad \approx \quad \psi(1) = \begin{pmatrix} I_\lambda & 2\Lambda_1 \\ 0 & I_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} 2I_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2}I_\lambda \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \Diamond_{j=1}^{\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2a_j \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \diamond D(2)^{\diamond\lambda}. \qquad (3.75)$$

Then by (3.74), (3.75) and Remark 2.1 we have

$$M \approx \left(\Diamond_{j=1}^{r} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_j \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \diamond D(2)^{\diamond\lambda} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} I_{k-r-\lambda} & 0 \\ U_4 & I_{k-r-\lambda} \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (3.76)$$

So by (3.70), (3.72) and Remark 2.1, we have

$$M \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond(p+q^-)} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond(r-p+q^+)} \diamond I_2^{\diamond q^0} \diamond D(2)^{\diamond\lambda}. \tag{3.77}$$

By Lemma 3.2, (3.63) and (3.71), we have

$$N_k R^{-1} N_k R \approx M. \tag{3.78}$$

Then (3.59) holds from (3.77) and (3.78). The proof of Lemma 3.8 is complete. ∎

4 The mixed (L_0, L_1)-concavity

Definition 4.1. *The mixed (L_0, L_1)-concavity and mixed (L_1, L_0)-concavity of a symplectic path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ are defined respectively by*

$$\mu_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) = i_{L_0}(\gamma) - \nu_{L_1}(\gamma), \ \ \mu_{(L_1,L_0)}(\gamma) = i_{L_1}(\gamma) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma).$$

By by Proposition C of [23], Proposition 6.1 of [19] and Theorem 3.1, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *There hold*

$$\mu_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) + \mu_{(L_1,L_0)}(\gamma) = i(\gamma^2) - \nu(\gamma^2) - n, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\mu_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) - \mu_{(L_1,L_0)}(\gamma) = concav^*_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(\gamma(\tau)), \ \ 0 < -\varepsilon \ll 1. \tag{4.2}$$

Theorem 1.3 in section 1 is a special case of the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *For $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, let $P = \gamma(\tau)$. If $i_{L_0}(\gamma) \geq 0$, $i_{L_1}(\gamma) \geq 0$, $i(\gamma) \geq n$, $\gamma^2(t) = \gamma(t-\tau)\gamma(\tau)$ for all $t \in [\tau, 2\tau]$, then*

$$\mu_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) + S^+_{P^2}(1) \geq 0, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\mu_{(L_1,L_0)}(\gamma) + S^+_{P^2}(1) \geq 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. The proofs of (4.3) and (4.4) are almost the same. We only prove (4.4) which yields Theorem 1.3.

Claim 4.1. Under the conditions of Theorem 4.1, if

$$P^2 \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond p_1} \diamond D(2)^{\diamond p_2} \diamond \tilde{P}, \tag{4.5}$$

then

$$i(\gamma^2)+2S^+_{P^2}(1)-\nu(\gamma^2)\geq n+p_1+p_2. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof of Claim 4.1. By Theorem 7.8 of [20] we have

$$\begin{aligned} P &\approx I_2^{\diamond q_1}\diamond\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}^{\diamond q_2}\diamond\begin{pmatrix}1&-1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}^{\diamond q_3}\diamond(-I_2)^{\diamond q_4}\diamond\begin{pmatrix}-1&1\\0&-1\end{pmatrix}^{\diamond q_5}\diamond\begin{pmatrix}-1&-1\\0&-1\end{pmatrix}^{\diamond q_6}\\ &\quad\diamond R(\theta_1)\diamond\cdots\diamond R(\theta_{q_7})\diamond\cdots\diamond R(\theta_{q_7+q_8})\diamond N_2(\omega_1,b_1)\diamond\cdots\diamond N_2(\omega_{q_9},b_{q_9})\\ &\quad\diamond D(2)^{\diamond q_{10}}\diamond D(-2)^{\diamond q_{11}}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where $q_i\geq 0$ for $1\leq i\leq 11$ with $q_1+q_2+\cdots+q_8+2q_9+q_{10}+q_{11}=n$, $\theta_j\in(0,\pi)$ for $1\leq j\leq q_7$, $\theta_j\in(\pi,2\pi)$ for $q_7+1\leq j\leq q_7+q_8$, $\omega_j\in(\mathbf{U}\setminus\mathbf{R})$ for $1\leq j\leq q_9$ and $b_j=\begin{pmatrix}b_{j1}&b_{j2}\\b_{j3}&b_{j4}\end{pmatrix}$ satisfying $b_{j2}\neq b_{j3}$ for $1\leq j\leq q_9$.

By (4.7) and Remark 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} P^2 &\approx I_2^{\diamond(q_1+q_4)}\diamond\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}^{\diamond(q_2+q_6)}\diamond\begin{pmatrix}1&-1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}^{\diamond(q_3+q_5)}\diamond R(2\theta_1)\diamond\cdots\diamond R(2\theta_{q_7})\diamond\\ &\quad\diamond\cdots\diamond R(2\theta_{q_7+q_8})\diamond N_2(\omega_1,b_1)^2\diamond\cdots\diamond N_2(\omega_{q_9},b_{q_9})^2\diamond D(2)^{\diamond(q_{10}+q_{11})}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

By Theorem 7.8 of [20] and (4.5) and (4.8) we have

$$q_2+q_6\geq p_1,\qquad q_{10}+q_{11}\geq p_2. \tag{4.9}$$

Since $\gamma^2(t)=\gamma(t-\tau)\gamma(\tau)$ for all $t\in[\tau,2\tau]$ we have γ^2 is also the twice iteration of γ in the periodic boundary value case, so by the Bott-type formula (cf. Theorem 9.2.1 of [21]), the proof of Lemma 4.1 of [23], and Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &i(\gamma^2)+2S^+_{P^2}(1)-\nu(\gamma^2)\\ =\ &2i(\gamma)+2S^+_P(1)+\sum_{\theta\in(0,\pi)}(S^+_P(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta})\\ &-(\sum_{\theta\in(0,\pi)}(S^-_P(e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta})+(\nu(P)-S^+_P(1))+(\nu_{-1}(P)-S^-_P(-1)))\\ =\ &2i(\gamma)+2(q_1+q_2)+(q_8-q_7)-(q_1+q_3+q_4+q_5)\\ \geq\ &2n+q_1+2q_2+(q_8-q_7)-(q_3+q_4+q_5)\\ =\ &n+(2q_1+3q_2+q_6+2q_8+2q_9+q_{10}+q_{11})\\ \geq\ &n+2q_2+q_6+q_{10}+q_{11}\\ \geq\ &n+p_1+p_2, \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where in the first equality we have used $S^+_{P^2}(1) = S^+_P(1) + S^+_P(-1)$ and $\nu(\gamma^2) = \nu(\gamma) + \nu_{-1}(\gamma)$, in the first inequality we have used the condition $i(\gamma) \geq n$, in the third equality we have used that $q_1 + q_2 + \cdots + q_8 + 2q_9 + q_{10} + q_{11} = n$, in the last inequality we have used (4.9). By (4.10) Claim 4.1 holds. ∎

Now we continue to prove Theorem 4.1. We set $\mathcal{A} = \mu_{(L_1,L_0)}(\gamma) + S^+_{P^2}(1)(\gamma)$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mu_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) + S^+_{P^2}(1)$.

By by Proposition C of [23] and Proposition 6.1 of [19] we have

$$i_{L_0}(\gamma) + i_{L_1}(\gamma) = i(\gamma^2) - n, \quad \nu_{L_0}(\gamma) + \nu_{L_1}(\gamma) = \nu(\gamma^2). \tag{4.11}$$

From (4.11) or (4.1) we have

$$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} = i(\gamma^2) + 2S^+_{P^2}(1) - \nu(\gamma^2) - n. \tag{4.12}$$

Case 1. $\nu_{L_0}(\gamma) = 0$.

In this case we have

$$i_{L_1}(\gamma) + S^+_{P^2}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma) \geq 0 + 0 - 0 = 0.$$

Then (4.4) holds.

Case 2. $\nu_{L_0}(\gamma) = n$.

In this case $P = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$, so A is invertible and we have

$$m^0(A^TC) = \nu_{L_1}(P) = \nu_{L_1}(\gamma). \tag{4.13}$$

By Lemma 3.1 we have

$$NP^{-1}NP = \begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 2A^TC & I_n \end{pmatrix} \approx I_2^{\diamond m^0(A^TC)} \diamond N_1(1,1)^{\diamond m^-(A^TC)} \diamond N_1(1,-1)^{\diamond m^+(A^TC)}. \tag{4.14}$$

By Claim 4.1, (4.14) and (4.12) we have

$$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} \geq m^-(A^TC). \tag{4.15}$$

By Theorem 3.1, Lemma 3.3 and (4.13) we have

$$\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A} \leq n - (m^+(A^TC + \nu_{L_1}(P)) = n - (m^+(A^TC) + m^0(A^TC)).$$

So we have

$$\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B} \geq m^+(A^TC) + m^0(A^TC) - n. \tag{4.16}$$

Then by (4.15) and (4.16) we have

$$2\mathcal{A} \geq m^-(A^TC) + (m^+(A^TC) + m^0(A^TC)) - n = 0$$

which yields $\mathcal{A} \geq 0$ and (4.4) holds.

Case 3. $1 \leq \nu_{L_0}(\gamma) = \nu_{L_0}(P) \leq n-1$.

In this case by (i) of Lemma 3.8 we have

$$P := \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & I_r & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 & 0 & 0 \\ A_3 & B_3 & A_2 & 0 \\ C_3 & D_3 & C_2 & D_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where A_1, A_2, A_3 are $r\times r$ matrices, D_1, D_2, D_3 are $(n-r)\times(n-r)$ matrices, B_1, B_3 are $r\times(n-r)$ matrices, and C_2, C_3 are $(n-r)\times r$ matrices. We divide Case 3 into the following 3 subcases.

Subcase 1. $A_3 = 0$.

In this subcase let $\lambda = \mathrm{rank} B_3$. Then $0 \leq \lambda \leq \min\{r, n-r\}$, A_1 is invertible, $A_1A_2 = I_r$ and $D_1D_2^T = I_{k-r}$, so we have A is invertible, furthermore there holds $m^0(A^TC) = \dim\ker C = \nu_{L_1}(P)$. Suppose $m^+(A_1) = p$, $m^-(A_1) = r-p$, then by (iv) of Lemma 3.8 we have

$$N_kR^{-1}N_kR \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond p+q^-} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond(r-p+q^+)} \diamond I_2^{\diamond q^0} \diamond D(2)^{\diamond\lambda}, \tag{4.17}$$

$$m^+(A^TC) = \lambda + q^+, \tag{4.18}$$

$$m^0(A^TC) = r - \lambda + q^0, \tag{4.19}$$

$$m^-(A^TC) = \lambda + q^-, \tag{4.20}$$

where $q^* \geq 0$ for $* = +, -, 0$ and $q^+ + q^0 + q^- = n - r - \lambda$.

Then by (4.17) and Claim 4.1 we have

$$i(\gamma^2) + 2S^+_{P^2}(1) - \nu(\gamma^2) \geq n + p + q^- + \lambda \geq n + q^- + \lambda. \tag{4.21}$$

By (4.21) and (4.12) we have

$$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} \geq q^- + \lambda. \tag{4.22}$$

By Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, and (4.18)-(4.20) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A} \\ \leq\ & n - m^+(A^TC) - m^0(A^TC) \\ =\ & n - (q^+ + \lambda + r - \lambda + q^0) \\ =\ & n - (r + q^+ + q^0). \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\mathcal{A}-\mathcal{B} \geq (r+q^{+}+q^{0})-n. \tag{4.23}$$

Since $q^{+}+q^{0}+q^{-}=n-r-\lambda$, by (4.22), (4.23) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{A} &\geq q^{-}+\lambda+(r+q^{+}+q^{0})-n \\ &= (q^{-}+q^{+}+q^{0}))-(n-r-\lambda) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

which yields (4.4).

Subcase 2. A_3 is invertible.

In this case by (ii) of Lemma 3.8 we have

$$P \sim \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & I_r \\ A_3 & A_2 \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} D_1 & 0 \\ \tilde{D}_3 & D_2 \end{pmatrix} := P_1 \diamond P_2, \tag{4.24}$$

where $\tilde{D}_3$ is a $(k-r)\times(k-r)$ matrix. Then by (4.24) and Lemma 3.2 we have

$$P^2 \approx (N_r P_1^{-1} N_r P_1) \diamond (N_{n-r} P_2^{-1} N_{n-r} P_2). \tag{4.25}$$

Let $e(N_r P_1^{-1} N_r P_1)=2m$, by Lemma 3.7 we have $0 \leq m \leq r$ and

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_1) \leq r-m, \quad 0<-\varepsilon \ll 1. \tag{4.26}$$

Also by (4.25) and (4.8), there exists $\tilde{P}_1 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2m)$ such that

$$N_r P_1^{-1} N_r P_1 \approx D(2)^{\diamond(r-m)} \diamond \tilde{P}_1. \tag{4.27}$$

By Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_{n-r} P_2^{-1} N_{n-r} P_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} I_{n-r} & 0 \\ 2D_1^T \tilde{D}_3 & I_{n-r} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond m^{-}(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3)} \diamond I_2^{\diamond m^{0}(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3)} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond m^{+}(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

So by Claim 4.1 and (4.27), (4.28), (4.25) and (4.12) we have

$$\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{B} \geq m^{-}(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3)+r-m. \tag{4.29}$$

By Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.3 together with Lemma 3.7, for $0 < -\varepsilon \ll 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A} &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_1) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_2) \\
&\leq r - m + (n-r) - m^+(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) - m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) \\
&= n - (m + m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3)).
\end{aligned}$$

We remind that we have used the fact $m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) = \ker(\tilde{D}_3) = \nu_{L_1}(P_2)$. So we have

$$\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B} \geq (m + m^+(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3)) - n. \tag{4.30}$$

Note that

$$m^+(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + m^-(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) = n - r. \tag{4.31}$$

Then by (4.29), (4.30) and (4.31) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2\mathcal{A} &\geq m^-(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + r - m + (m + m^+(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3)) - n \\
&= m^+(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + m^0(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) + m^-(D_1^T \tilde{D}_3) - (n-r) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

which yields (4.4).

Subcase 3. $1 \leq \mathrm{rank} A_3 = l \leq r-1$.

In this case by (iii) of Lemma 3.8 we have

$$P \sim \begin{pmatrix} U & I_l \\ \Lambda & V \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}_1 & \tilde{B}_1 & I_{r-l} & 0 \\ 0 & D_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{B}_3 & \tilde{A}_2 & 0 \\ \tilde{C}_3 & \tilde{D}_3 & \tilde{C}_2 & \tilde{D}_2 \end{pmatrix} := P_3 \diamond P_4, \tag{4.32}$$

where $\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2$ are $(r-l)\times(r-l)$ matrices, $\tilde{B}_1, \tilde{B}_3$ are $(r-l)\times(n-r)$ matrices, $\tilde{C}_2, \tilde{C}_3$ are $(n-r)\times(r-l)$ matrices, $D_1, \tilde{D}_2, \tilde{D}_3$ are $(n-r)\times(n-r)$ matrices, U, V, Λ are $l \times l$ matrices, and Λ is invertible.

Let $\lambda = \mathrm{rank}\tilde{B}_3$ and denote $P_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} \end{pmatrix}$, where $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D}$ are $(n-l)$-order real matrices. Assume $m^+(\tilde{A}_1) = p$, $m^-(\tilde{A}_1) = r - l - p$, then by (iv) of Lemma 3.8 we have

$$N_k P_4^{-1} N_k P_4 \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond(p+q^-)} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\diamond(r-l-p+q^+)} \diamond I_2^{\diamond q^0} \diamond D(2)^{\diamond\lambda}, \tag{4.33}$$

$$m^+(\tilde{A}^T \tilde{C}) = \lambda + q^+, \tag{4.34}$$

$$m^0(\tilde{A}^T \tilde{C}) = r - l - \lambda + q^0, \tag{4.35}$$

$$m^-(\tilde{A}^T \tilde{C}) = \lambda + q^-, \tag{4.36}$$

where $q^* \geq 0$ for $* = +, -, 0$ and $q^+ + q^0 + q^- = n - r - \lambda$.

Let $e(N_l P_3^{-1} N_l P_3) = 2m$, by Lemma 3.7 we have $0 \leq m \leq l$

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_3) \leq l - m, \quad 0 < -\varepsilon \ll 1. \tag{4.37}$$

By similar argumet as in the proof of Subcase 2, there exists $\tilde{P}_3 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2m)$ such that

$$N_r P_3^{-1} N_r P_3 \approx D(2)^{\diamond(l-m)} \diamond \tilde{P}_3. \tag{4.38}$$

So by Claim 4.1, (4.32), (4.33), (4.38), and (4.12) we have

$$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B} \geq q^- + l - m + \lambda. \tag{4.39}$$

By Theorem 3.1, Lemma 3.3, (4.34), (4.35) and (4.37), for $0 \leq -\varepsilon \ll 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A} &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_3) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_4) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sgn} M_\varepsilon(P_3) + (n - l) - m^+(\tilde{A}^T\tilde{C}) - m^0(\tilde{A}^T\tilde{C}) \\ &\leq l - m + (n - l) - (\lambda + q^+) - (r - l - \lambda + q^0) \\ &= n + (l - m) - (q^+ + q^0 + r). \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B} \geq (q^+ + q^0 + r) - n - (l - m). \tag{4.40}$$

Since $q^+ + q^0 + q^- = n - r - \lambda$, by (4.39) and (4.40) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathcal{A} &\geq q^- + l - m + \lambda + (q^+ + q^0 + r) - n - (l - m) \\ &= (q^+ + q^0 + q^-) - (n - r - \lambda) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

which yields (4.4). Hence (4.4) holds in Cases 1-3 and the proof of Theorem 4.1 is complete. ∎

Remark 4.1. Both the estimates (4.3) and (4.4) in Theorem 4.1 are optimal . In fact, we can construct a symplectic path satisfying the conditions of Theorem 4.1 such that the equalities in (4.3) and (4.4) hold. Let $\tau = \pi$ and $\gamma(t) = R(t)^{\diamond n}$, $t \in [0, \pi]$. It is easy to see that $i_{L_0}(\gamma) = \sum_{0<t<\pi} \nu_{L_0}(\gamma(t)) = 0$ and also $i_{L_1}(\gamma) = \sum_{0<t<\pi} \nu_{L_1}(\gamma(t)) = 0$, $\nu_{L_0}(\gamma) = \nu_{L_1}(\gamma) = n$, $\gamma^2(t) = \gamma(t - \pi)\gamma(\pi)$ for $t \in [\pi, 2\pi]$, $i(\gamma) = n$ and $P = \gamma(\pi) = -I_{2n}$ hence by Lemma 2.2 $S^+_{P^2}(1) = S^+_{I_{2n}}(1) = n$. So we have

$$\mu_{(L_0,L_1)}(\gamma) + S^+_{P^2}(1) = \mu_{(L_1,L_0)}(\gamma) + S^+_{P^2}(1) = 0 - n + n = 0.$$

5 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

In this section we prove Theorems 1.1-1.2.

For $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_b^{s,c}(2n)$, let $j_\Sigma : \Sigma \to [0, +\infty)$ be the gauge function of Σ defined by

$$j_\Sigma(0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad j_\Sigma(x) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 \mid \frac{x}{\lambda} \in C\}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\},$$

where C is the domain enclosed by Σ.

Define

$$H_\alpha(x) = (j_\Sigma(x))^\alpha, \ \alpha > 1, \quad H_\Sigma(x) = H_2(x), \ \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}. \tag{5.1}$$

Then $H_\Sigma \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^{2n}\backslash\{0\}, \mathbf{R}) \cap C^{1,1}(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$.

We consider the following fixed energy problem

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= JH'_\Sigma(x(t)), && (5.2) \\ H_\Sigma(x(t)) &= 1, && (5.3) \\ x(-t) &= Nx(t), && (5.4) \\ x(\tau + t) &= x(t), \quad \forall\, t \in \mathbf{R}. && (5.5) \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$ ($\mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, \alpha)$ for $\alpha = 2$ in (5.1)) the set of all solutions (τ, x) of problem (5.2)-(5.5) and by $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma, 2)$ the set of all geometrically distinct solutions of (5.2)-(5.5). By Remark 1.2 of [19] or discussion in [23], elements in $\mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$ are one to one correspondent. So we have ${}^\#\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma)={}^\#\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma, 2)$.

For readers' convenience in the following we list some known results which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

In the following of this paper, we write $(i_{L_0}(\gamma, k), \nu_{L_0}(\gamma, k)) = (i_{L_0}(\gamma^k), \nu_{L_0}(\gamma^k))$ for any symplectic path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $k \in \mathbf{N}$, where γ^k is defined by Definition 2.5. We have

Lemma 5.1. (Theorem 1.5 and of [19] and Theorem 4.3 of [25]) *Let* $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau_j}(2n)$ *for* $j = 1, \cdots, q$. *Let* $M_j = \gamma_j^2(2\tau_j) = N\gamma_j(\tau_j)^{-1}N\gamma_j(\tau_j)$, *for* $j = 1, \cdots, q$. *Suppose*

$$\hat{i}_{L_0}(\gamma_j) > 0, \quad j = 1, \cdots, q.$$

Then there exist infinitely many $(R, m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_q) \in \mathbf{N}^{q+1}$ *such that*

(i) $\nu_{L_0}(\gamma_j, 2m_j \pm 1) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_j)$,

(ii) $i_{L_0}(\gamma_j, 2m_j - 1) + \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_j, 2m_j - 1) = R - (i_{L_1}(\gamma_j) + n + S^+_{M_j}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_j))$,

(iii) $i_{L_0}(\gamma_j, 2m_j + 1) = R + i_{L_0}(\gamma_j)$.

and (iv) $\nu(\gamma_j^2, 2m_j \pm 1) = \nu(\gamma_j^2)$,

(v) $i(\gamma_j^2, 2m_j - 1) + \nu(\gamma_j^2, 2m_j - 1) = 2R - (i(\gamma_j^2) + 2S_{M_j}^+(1) - \nu(\gamma_j^2))$,

(vi) $i(\gamma_j^2, 2m_j + 1) = 2R + i(\gamma_j^2)$,

where we have set $i(\gamma_j^2, n_j) = i(\gamma_j^{2n_j})$, $\nu(\gamma_j^2, n_j) = \nu(\gamma_j^{2n_j})$ *for* $n_j \in \mathbf{N}$.

For any $(\tau, x) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$, there is a symplectic path $\gamma_x \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ corresponding to it. For $m \in \mathbf{N}$, we denote by $i_{L_j}(x, m) = i_{L_j}(\gamma_x^m)$ and $\nu_{L_j}(x, m) = \nu_{L_j}(\gamma_x^m)$ for $j = 0, 1$. Also we denote by $i(x, m) = i(\gamma_x^{2m})$ and $\nu(x, m) = \nu(\gamma_x^{2m})$. We remind that the symplectic path γ_x^m is defined in the interval $[0, \frac{m\tau}{2}]$ and the symplectic path γ_x^{2m} is defined in the interval $[0, m\tau]$. If $m = 1$, we denote by $i(x) = i(x, 1)$ and $\nu(x) = \nu(x, 1)$. By Lemma 6.3 of [19] we have

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose* ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) < +\infty$. *Then there exist an integer* $K \geq 0$ *and an injection map* $\phi : \mathbf{N} + K \mapsto \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2) \times \mathbf{N}$ *such that*

(i) For any $k \in \mathbf{N} + K$, $[(\tau, x)] \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$ *and* $m \in \mathbf{N}$ *satisfying* $\phi(k) = ([(\tau\ , x)], m)$, *there holds*

$$i_{L_0}(x, m) \leq k - 1 \leq i_{L_0}(x, m) + \nu_{L_0}(x, m) - 1,$$

where x *has minimal period* τ.

(ii) For any $k_j \in \mathbf{N} + K$, $k_1 < k_2$, $(\tau_j, x_j) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$ *satisfying* $\phi(k_j) = ([(\tau_j\ , x_j)], m_j)$ *with* $j = 1, 2$ *and* $[(\tau_1\ , x_1)] = [(\tau_2\ , x_2)]$, *there holds*

$$m_1 < m_2.$$

Lemma 5.3. (Lemma 7.2 of [19]) *Let* $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ *be extended to* $[0, +\infty)$ *by* $\gamma(\tau + t) = \gamma(t)\gamma(\tau)$ *for all* $t > 0$. *Suppose* $\gamma(\tau) = M = P^{-1}(I_2 \diamond \tilde{M})P$ *with* $\tilde{M} \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n-2)$ *and* $i(\gamma) \geq n$. *Then we have*

$$i(\gamma, 2) + 2S_{M^2}^+(1) - \nu(\gamma, 2) \geq n + 2.$$

Lemma 5.4 (Lemma 7.3 of [19]) *For any* $(\tau, x) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$ *and* $m \in \mathbf{N}$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned} i_{L_0}(x, m+1) - i_{L_0}(x, m) &\geq 1, \\ i_{L_0}(x, m+1) + \nu_{L_0}(x, m+1) - 1 &\geq i_{L_0}(x, m+1) > i_{L_0}(x, m) + \nu_{L_0}(x, m) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It is suffices to consider the case ${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) < +\infty$. Since $-\Sigma = \Sigma$, for $(\tau, x) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &H_\Sigma(x) = H_\Sigma(-x), \\ &H'_\Sigma(x) = -H'_\Sigma(-x), \\ &H''_\Sigma(x) = H''_\Sigma(-x). \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

So $(\tau, -x) \in \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2)$. By (5.6) and the definition of γ_x we have that

$$\gamma_x = \gamma_{-x}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(i_{L_0}(x, m), \nu_{L_0}(x, m)) = (i_{L_0}(-x, m), \nu_{L_0}(-x, m)), \\ &(i_{L_1}(x, m), \nu_{L_1}(x, m)) = (i_{L_1}(-x, m), \nu_{L_1}(-x, m)), \quad \forall m \in \mathbf{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

So we can write

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma, 2) = \{[(\tau_j, x_j)] | j = 1, \cdots, p\} \cup \{[(\tau_k, x_k)], [(\tau_k, -x_k)] | k = p+1, \cdots, p+q\}. \tag{5.8}$$

with $x_j(\mathbf{R}) = -x_j(\mathbf{R})$ for $j = 1, \cdots, p$ and $x_k(\mathbf{R}) \neq -x_k(\mathbf{R})$ for $k = p+1, \cdots, p+q$. Here we remind that (τ_j, x_j) has minimal period τ_j for $j = 1, \cdots, p+q$ and $x_j(\frac{\tau_j}{2} + t) = -x_j(t),\ t \in \mathbf{R}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, p$.

By Lemma 5.2 we have an integer $K \geq 0$ and an injection map $\phi : \mathbf{N} + K \to \mathcal{J}_b(\Sigma, 2) \times \mathbf{N}$. By (5.7), (τ_k, x_k) and $(\tau_k, -x_k)$ have the same (i_{L_0}, ν_{L_0})-indices. So by Lemma 5.2, without loss of generality, we can further require that

$$\mathrm{Im}(\phi) \subseteq \{[(\tau_k, x_k)] | k = 1, 2, \cdots, p+q\} \times \mathbf{N}. \tag{5.9}$$

By the strict convexity of H_Σ and (6.19) of [19]), we have

$$\hat{i}_{L_0}(x_k) > 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \cdots, p+q.$$

Applying Lemma 5.1 to the following associated symplectic paths

$$\gamma_1,\ \cdots,\ \gamma_{p+q},\ \gamma_{p+q+1},\ \cdots,\ \gamma_{p+2q}$$

of $(\tau_1, x_1),\ \cdots,\ (\tau_{p+q}, x_{p+q}),\ (2\tau_{p+1}, x_{p+1}^2),\ \cdots,\ (2\tau_{p+q}, x_{p+q}^2)$ respectively, there exists a vector $(R, m_1, \cdots, m_{p+2q}) \in \mathbf{N}^{p+2q+1}$ such that $R > K + n$ and

$$i_{L_0}(x_k, 2m_k + 1) = R + i_{L_0}(x_k), \tag{5.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &i_{L_0}(x_k, 2m_k - 1) + \nu_{L_0}(x_k, 2m_k - 1) \\ = \ &R - (i_{L_1}(x_k) + n + S^+_{M_k}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(x_k)), \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

for $k = 1, \cdots, p+q$, $M_k = \gamma_k^2(\tau_k)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & i_{L_0}(x_k, 4m_k+2) = R + i_{L_0}(x_k, 2), & (5.12)\\ & i_{L_0}(x_k, 4m_k-2) + \nu_{L_0}(x_k, 4m_k-2) & \\ = \;& R - (i_{L_1}(x_k, 2) + n + S^+_{M_k}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(x_k, 2)), & (5.13)\end{aligned}$$

for $k = p+q+1, \cdots, p+2q$ and $M_k = \gamma_k^4(2\tau_k) = \gamma_k^2(\tau_k)^2$.

By Lemma 5.1, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} i(x_k, 2m_k+1) &= 2R + i(x_k), & (5.14)\\ i(x_k, 2m_k-1) + \nu(x_k, 2m_k-1) &= 2R - (i(x_k) + 2S^+_{M_k}(1) - \nu(x_k)), & (5.15)\end{aligned}$$

for $k = 1, \cdots, p+q$, $M_k = \gamma_k^2(\tau_k)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} i(x_k, 4m_k+2) &= 2R + i(x_k, 2), & (5.16)\\ i(x_k, 4m_k-2) + \nu(x_k, 4m_k-2) &= 2R - (i(x_k, 2) + 2S^+_{M_k}(1) - \nu(x_k, 2)), & (5.17)\end{aligned}$$

for $k = p+q+1, \cdots, p+2q$ and $M_k = \gamma_k^4(2\tau_k) = \gamma_k^2(\tau_k)^2$.

From (5.9), we can set

$$\phi(R - (s-1)) = ([(\tau_{k(s)}, x_{k(s)})], m(s)), \qquad \forall s \in S := \{1, 2, \cdots, n\},$$

where $k(s) \in \{1, 2, \cdots, p+q\}$ and $m(s) \in \mathbf{N}$.

We continue our proof to study the symmetric and asymmetric orbits separately. Let

$$S_1 = \{s \in S | k(s) \le p\}, \qquad S_2 = S \setminus S_1.$$

We shall prove that ${}^\# S_1 \le p$ and ${}^\# S_2 \le 2q$, together with the definitions of S_1 and S_2, these yield Theorem 1.1.

Claim 5.1. ${}^\# S_1 \le p$.

Proof of Claim 5.1. By the definition of S_1, $([(\tau_{k(s)}, x_{k(s)})], m(s))$ is symmetric when $k(s) \le p$. We further prove that $m(s) = 2m_{k(s)}$ for $s \in S_1$.

In fact, by the definition of ϕ and Lemma 5.2, for all $s = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) &\le (R - (s-1)) - 1 = R - s \\ &\le i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) + \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) - 1. & (5.18)\end{aligned}$$

By the strict convexity of H_Σ and Lemma 2.3, we have $i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}) \ge 0$, so there holds

$$i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) \le R - s < R \le R + i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}) = i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 2m_{k(s)} + 1), \qquad (5.19)$$

for every $s = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, where we have used (5.10) in the last equality. Note that the proofs of (5.18) and (5.19) do not depend on the condition $s \in S_1$.

It is easy to see that γ_{x_k} satisfies conditions of Theorem 4.1 with $\tau = \frac{\tau_k}{2}$. Note that by definition $i_{L_1}(x_k) = i_{L_1}(\gamma_{x_k})$ and $\nu_{L_0}(x_k) = \nu_{L_0}(\gamma_{x_k})$. So by Theorem 4.1 we have

$$i_{L_1}(x_k) + S^+_{M_k}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(x_k) \geq 0, \quad \forall k = 1, \cdots, p. \tag{5.20}$$

Hence by (5.18) and (5.20), if $k(s) \leq p$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 2m_{k(s)} - 1) + \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 2m_{k(s)} - 1) - 1 \\ = \; & R - (i_{L_1}(x_{k(s)}) + n + S^+_{M_{k(s)}}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)})) - 1 \\ \leq \; & R - \frac{1-n}{2} - 1 - n \\ < \; & R - s \\ \leq \; & i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) + \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Thus by (5.19) and (5.21) and Lemma 5.4 we have

$$2m_{k(s)} - 1 < m(s) < 2m_{k(s)} + 1.$$

Hence

$$m(s) = 2m_{k(s)}.$$

So we have

$$\phi(R - s + 1) = ([(\tau_{k(s)}, x_{k(s)})], 2m_{k(s)}), \qquad \forall s \in S_1.$$

Then by the injectivity of ϕ, it induces another injection map

$$\phi_1 : S_1 \to \{1, \cdots, p\}, \; s \mapsto k(s).$$

There for ${}^{\#}S_1 \leq p$. Claim 5.1 is proved.

Claim 5.2. ${}^{\#}S_2 \leq 2q$.

Proof of Claim 5.2. By the formulas (5.14)-(5.17), and (59) of [18] (also Claim 4 on p. 352 of [21]), we have

$$m_k = 2m_{k+q} \quad \text{for} \;\; k = p+1, p+2, \cdots, p+q. \tag{5.22}$$

By Theorem 4.1 we have

$$i_{L_1}(x_k, 2) + S^+_{M_k}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(x_k, 2) \geq 0, \quad p+1 \leq k \leq p+q. \tag{5.23}$$

By (5.13), (5.18), (5.22) and (5.23), for $p+1 \le k(s) \le p+q$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 2m_{k(s)}-2) + \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 2m_{k(s)}-2) - 1 \\
= \;& i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 4m_{k(s)+q}-2) + \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 4m_{k(s)+q}-2) - 1 \\
= \;& R - (i_{L_1}(x_{k(s)}, 2) + n + S^+_{M_{k(s)}}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, 2)) - 1 \\
= \;& R - (i_{L_1}(x_k, 2) + S^+_{M_k}(1) - \nu_{L_0}(x_k, 2)) - 1 - n \\
\le \;& R - 1 - n \\
< \;& R - s \\
\le \;& i_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) + \nu_{L_0}(x_{k(s)}, m(s)) - 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Thus by (5.19), (5.24) and Lemma 5.4, we have

$$2m_{k(s)} - 2 < m(s) < 2m_{k(s)} + 1, \qquad p < k(s) \le p+q.$$

So

$$m(s) \in \{2m_{k(s)} - 1, 2m_{k(s)}\}, \qquad \text{for } \; p < k(s) \le p+q.\}$$

Especially this yields that for any s_0 and $s \in S_2$, if $k(s) = k(s_0)$, then

$$m(s) \in \{2m_{k(s)} - 1, 2m_{k(s)}\} = \{2m_{k(s_0)} - 1, 2m_{k(s_0)}\}.$$

Thus by the injectivity of the map ϕ from Lemma 5.2, we have

$${}^{\#}\{s \in S_2 | k(s) = k(s_0)\} \le 2$$

which yields Claim 5.2.

By Claim 5.1 and Claim 5.2, we have

$${}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma) = {}^{\#}\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_b(\Sigma, 2) = p + 2q \ge {}^{\#}S_1 + {}^{\#}S_2 = n.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We call a closed characteristic x on Σ a *dual brake orbit* on Σ if $x(-t) = -Nx(t)$. Then by the similar proof of Lemma 3.1 of [34], a closed characteristic x on Σ can became a dual brake orbit after suitable time translation if and only if $x(\mathbf{R}) = -Nx(\mathbf{R})$. So by Lemma 3.1 of [34] again, if a closed characteristic x on Σ can both became brake orbits and dual brake orbits after suitable translation, then $x(\mathbf{R}) = Nx(\mathbf{R}) = -Nx(\mathbf{R})$, Thus $x(\mathbf{R}) = -x(\mathbf{R})$.

Since we also have $-N\Sigma=\Sigma$, $(-N)^2=I_{2n}$ and $(-N)J=-J(-N)$, dually by the same proof of Theorem 1.1(with the estimate (4.3) in Theorem 4.1), there are at least n geometrically distinct dual brake orbits on Σ.

If there are exactly n closed characteristics on Σ. By Theorem 1.1 all of them must be brake orbits on Σ after suitable time translation. By the same argument all the n closed characteristics must be dual brake orbits on Σ. Then by the argument in the first paragraph of the proof of this theorem, all these n closed characteristics on Σ must be symmetric. Hence all of them must be symmetric brake orbits after suitable time translation. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete. ∎

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, V. Benci, Y. Long, A note on the existence of multiple brake orbits. *Nonlinear Anal. T. M. A.*, 21 (1993) 643-649.

[2] V. Benci, Closed geodesics for the Jacobi metric and periodic solutions of prescribed energy of natural Hamiltonian systems. *Ann. I. H. P. Analyse Nonl.* 1 (1984) 401-412.

[3] V. Benci, F. Giannoni, A new proof of the existence of a brake orbit. In "Advanced Topics in the Theory of Dynamical Systems". *Notes Rep. Math. Sci. Eng.* 6 (1989) 37-49.

[4] S. Bolotin, Libration motions of natural dynamical systems. *Vestnik Moskov Univ. Ser. I. Mat. Mekh.* 6 (1978) 72-77 (in Russian).

[5] S. Bolotin, V.V. Kozlov, Librations with many degrees of freedom. *J. Appl. Math. Mech.* 42 (1978) 245-250 (in Russian).

[6] S. E. Cappell, R. Lee, E. Y. Miller, On the Maslov-type index. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 47 (1994) 121-186.

[7] C. Conley, E. Zehnder, Morse-type index theory for flows and periodic solutions for Hamiltonian equations. *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* 37 (1984), 207-253.

[8] R. Giambò, F. Giannoni, P. Piccione, Orthogonal Geodesic Chords, Brake Orbits and Homoclinic Orbits in Riemannian Manifolds, *Adv. Diff. Eq.,* 10, (2005) 931C960.

[9] R. Giambò, F. Giannoni, P. Piccione, Existence of orthogonal geodesic chords on Riemannian manifolds with concave boundary and homeomorphic to the N-demensional disk. *Nonlinear Anal. T. M. A.* 73 (2010) 290-337.

[10] R. Giambò, F. Giannoni, P. Piccione, Potential wells with a unique brake orbit. Counterexamples to a conjecture by H. Seifert. arXiv: 1203.5198vl [math. DS].

[11] H. Gluck, W. Ziller, Existence of periodic solutions of conservtive systems. *Seminar on Minimal Submanifolds,* Princeton University Press(1983) 65-98.

[12] E. W. C. van Groesen, Analytical mini-max methods for Hamiltonian brake orbits of prescribed energy. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 132 (1988) 1-12.

[13] F. Guo, C. Liu, Multiplicity of Lagrangian orbits on symmetric star-shaped hypersurfaces. *Nonlinear Anal.* 69(4) (2008), 1425C1436.

[14] K. Hayashi, Periodic solution of classical Hamiltonian systems. *Tokyo J. Math.* 6(1983), 473-486.

[15] H. Hofer, K. Wysocki, and E. Zehnder, The dynamics on three-dimensional strictly convex energy surfaces. *Ann. Math.* (2) **148** (1998) 197-289.

[16] C. Liu, Maslov-type index theory for symplectic paths with Lagrangian boundary conditions. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.* 7 (2007) no. 1, 131–161.

[17] C. Liu, Asymptotically linear Hamiltonian systems with Lagrangian boundary conditions. *Pacific J. Math.* 232 (2007) no.1, 233-255.

[18] C. Liu, Y. Long, C. Zhu, Multiplicity of closed characteristics on symmetric convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. *Math. Ann.* 323 (2002) no. 2, 201–215.

[19] C. Liu and D. Zhang, Iteration theory of L-index and multiplicity of brake orbits. arXiv: 0908.0021vl [math. SG].

[20] Y. Long, Bott formula of the Maslov-type index theory. *Pacific J. Math.* 187 (1999) 113-149.

[21] Y. Long, Index Theory for Symplectic Paths with Applications. Birkhäuser. Basel. (2002).

[22] Y. Long, Maslov-type index, degenerate critical points, and asymptotically linear Hamiltonian systems. *Science in China Ser. A* (1990) 673-682.

[23] Y. Long, D. Zhang, C. Zhu, Multiple brake orbits in bounded convex symmetric domains. *Advances in Math.* 203 (2006) 568-635.

[24] Y. Long, E. Zehnder, Morse Theory for forced oscillations of asymptotically linear Hamiltonian systems. In *Stoc. Proc. Phys. and Geom.*, S. Albeverio et al. ed. World Sci. (1990) 528-563.

[25] Y. Long and C. Zhu, Closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. *Ann. Math.,* **155** (2002) 317-368.

[26] K. Mohnke, Holomorphic disks and the Chord Conjecture, *Ann. of Math.* 154 (2001), 219C222.

[27] P. H. Rabinowitz, On the existence of periodic solutions for a class of symmetric Hamiltonian systems. *Nonlinear Anal. T. M. A.* 11 (1987) 599-611.

[28] H. Seifert, Periodische Bewegungen mechanischer Systeme. *Math. Z.* 51 (1948) 197-216.

[29] A. Szulkin, An index theory and existence of multiple brake orbits for star-shaped Hamiltonian systems. *Math. Ann.* 283 (1989) 241-255.

[30] C. Viterbo, A new obstruction to embedding Lagrangian tori. *Invent. Math.* 100 (1990) 301-320.

[31] A. Weinstein, Normal modes for nonlinear Hamiltonian systems, *Inv. Math.* 20 (1973) 47C57.

[32] D. Zhang and C. Liu, Multiple brake orbits on compact convex symmetric reversible hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. arXiv: 1110.0722vl [math. SG].

[33] D. Zhang and C. Liu, Multiplicity of brake orbits on compact convex symmetric reversible hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ for $n \geq 4$, *preprint*.

[34] D. Zhang, Brake type closed characteristics on reversible compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$.*Nonlinear Anal. T. M. A.* 74 (2011) 3149-3158.

[35] D. Zhang, Minimal period problems for brake orbits of nonlinear autonomous reversible semipositive Hamiltonian systems. arXiv: 1110.6915vl [math. SG].